FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-243
Wednesday
20 December 1989

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-243

CONTENTS

20 December 1989

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Spread of Missile Technology Discussed *[PRAVDA 19 Dec]* 1

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

TASS Reports Perfilyev Press Briefing 20 Dec 3
  Czechoslovkia's Calfa Visit 3
  Trade Agreement With EC 3
  Chilean Elections 3
  U.S.-Soviet Relations, Naval Arms 3
  U.S. Statement on Naval Talks 4
  Romanian Events 4
Foreign Ministry Statement on UN Apartheid Session *[TASS]* 5
West Seen 'Nurturing Schemes' in East Europe *[Pogodin on Moscow International]* 5

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Further Reportage on Bush-Mitterrand Talks 7
  IZVESTIYA Details Talks *[18 Dec]* 7
  PRAVDA Report *[19 Dec]* 7
TASS Views Bush Comments on Arms Reductions 8

China

PRC 'Intensified Border Surveillance' *[Moscow International]* 8
PRAVDA Cites Improvement in PRC Relations *[Moscow International]* 9

Northeast Asia

Further Reportage on Peace Talks With Japan 9
  Rogachev Holds News Conference *[Tokyo KYODO]* 9
  Continuation of Talks Necessary *[Tokyo KYODO]* 10
Hokkaido Police Arrest Crew for Joint Fishing *[Moscow International]* 10
Improved Trade Between ROK, CSSR Reported *[Moscow International]* 11
ROK Businessmen Arrive in Soviet Far East *[Moscow International]* 11
Association of Koreans in USSR Holds Meeting *[Moscow International]* 11
DPRK Film Cooperation, Exchanges Discussed *[Moscow International]* 11
Rogachev Meets Australian Counterpart in Tokyo *[TASS]* 12

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Commentary Welcomes Latest Cambodian Initiative *[Valentinov on Moscow International]* 12

Near East & South Asia

Moscow Comments on Islamic Fundamentalism *[Vasiliyev on Radio Peace and Progress]* 13
Afghan Rebel Missiles Target Civilians *[IZVESTIYA 19 Dec]* 13

East Europe

Reportage on Situation in Romania 14

  - Borders With Soviet Union Closed *[Cologne Radio]* 14
  - Moscow TV on Situation 14
  - Ceausescu 'Calm' Noted *[Moscow TV]* 14
  - Business Trips to Romania Normal *[TASS]* 15
  - Bulgarian Border Situation Reported *[Moscow TV]* 15
  - More on Unrest, Border Closings *[Moscow TV]* 15
  - Romanian Media Silent on Unrest *[IZVESTIYA 20 Dec]* 16
- GDR Extraordinary SED Congress Reported 16
  - IZVESTIYA on Congress Decisions *[18 Dec]* 16
  - Renamed SED-PDS Pursues Renewal *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 19 Dec]* 17
  - Commentary Views Congress *[Kondrashov on TASS]* 18
- 1953 GDR Uprising To Be Reassessed Soon *[Cologne Radio]* 19
- GDR Security Body Disbanded; Neo-Nazis Mushroom *[IZVESTIYA 19 Dec]* 19
- Ryzhkov Welcomes CSSR Premier Calfa on Arrival *[TASS]* 19
- Soviet Public Figures on CSSR in 1968, 1989 *[Bratislava PRAVDA 6 Dec]* 19
- IZVESTIYA Updates CSSR Developments *[19 Dec]* 20
- Civic Forum Activity at CSSR Plant Described *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 17 Dec]* 20
- Bulgarian Assembly Condemns 14 Dec Incident *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 19 Dec]* 21
- Nemeth Resignation From MSZP Presidium Noted *[TASS]* 22
- MSZMP Congress Decides on Party's Renewal *[IZVESTIYA 19 Dec]* 22
- PZPR Protests Worsening Law, Order Situation *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 16 Dec]* 22
- SFRY's Markovic Cited on Economy, Reform *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 20 Dec]* 23
- Soviet Scholar Views Changes in East Europe *[Moscow International]* 23

West Europe

- Shevardnadze's Visit to Brussels Reported 24
  - Meets NATO's Woerner; Cold War Said Over *[TASS]* 24
  - Says Talks With Woerner 'Useful' *[Moscow TV]* 24
  - Comment on Romanian Events *[AFP]* 25
  - Addresses Europarliament on German Issue *[PRAVDA 20 Dec]* 25
  - Meets EC Leader, Foreign Ministers *[PRAVDA 20 Dec]* 31
  - Interviewed at Brussels Airport *[Moscow TV]* 32
- Shevardnadze Meets Thatcher in London 33
  - European Issues Discussed *[TASS]* 33
  - German Reunification Discussed *[London PRESS ASSOCIATION]* 33
- Shevardnadze Returns to Moscow From W. Europe *[TASS]* 34
- Ambassador to FRG Discusses German Question *[Hamburg BILD AM SONNTAG 17 Dec]* 34
- Foreign Ministry Official Receives FRG Envoy *[IZVESTIYA 19 Dec]* 35

Latin America & Caribbean

- Reportage, Reaction to U.S.-Panama Clash 35
  - Moscow Reports U.S. 'Aggression' *[Moscow Radio]* 35
  - TASS Cites Fitzwater 35
  - 'Serious Concern' in USSR *[TASS]* 36
  - U.S. Military Action Described *[TASS]* 36
  - Supreme Soviet Committee on Attack *[TASS]* 36
  - Solidarity Committee Denounces Attack *[TASS]* 36
  - TASS Interviews President Rodriguez 37
  - TASS Interviews Foreign Minister Kam 37
  - U.S. Military Notes Casualties *[TASS]* 38
  - TASS Reports Bush Address 38
  - SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA on 'Invasion' *[Bogomolov, 21 Dec]* 38
  - Commentary Sees U.S. 'Brazen Act' *[Mayorov on Moscow International]* 39
  - World Condemnation Urged *[Chigir on TASS]* 39

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Congress of People's Deputies

People's Deputies Discuss Second Congress *[SOVETSKAYA KULTURA 12 Dec]* 41
14 Dec Congressional Section Speeches Reported 46
  Abalkin on Economic Reform *[IZVESTIYA 17 Dec]* 46
  Sobchak Slams Ryzhkov Report *[IZVESTIYA 16 Dec]* 51
  Sciences Academy's Bunich *[IZVESTIYA 16 Dec]* 53
15 Dec Congress of People's Deputies Proceedings 55
  Arutyunyan Says Ryzhkov Program 'Key' *[PRAVDA 16 Dec]* 55
  Kirghiz Deputy Endorses Ryzhkov Report *[PRAVDA 16 Dec]* 57
  Gidaspov Makes Leningrad Comparison *[PRAVDA 18 Dec]* 58
  Irkutsk's Potapov on Ryzhkov Program *[PRAVDA 17 Dec]* 60
  Shalayev Gives Trade Union Position *[PRAVDA 17 Dec]* 61
  Tajikistan's Pallayev *[PRAVDA 17 Dec]* 64
Bashkir Deputy on Parlous State of Rail Network *[PRAVDA 18 Dec]* 66
Ryzhkov Plan Reflects 'Real Possibilities' *[PRAVDA 18 Dec]* 66
Moscow TV Relays 19 Dec Congressional Session 67
  1300 GMT 67
  1333 GMT 67
  1426 GMT 68
  1523 GMT 68
  1624 GMT 69
  1650 GMT 69
  1731 GMT 70
  1823 GMT 71
19 Dec Congressional Speeches Reported 71
  Slyunkov Address *[Moscow TV]* 71
  Admiral Chernavin *[Moscow TV]* 73
  Lukyanov on Article 95 Amendment *[Moscow Radio]* 73
  Lithuania's Landsbergis *[Moscow TV]* 74
  Gorbachev Remarks *[Moscow TV]* 74
TASS Summarizes 19 Dec Congress Activities 75
Deputies Address Congress on 'Special' Issues *[TASS]* 76
Deputies Vote on Constitutional Amendments *[TASS]* 76
Bill Adopted on Instructions to Parliament *[TASS]* 76
Ryzhkov Interviewed After Approval of Program *[Moscow International]* 77
Maslyukov, Dzasokhov Give News Conference 19 Dec *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 20 Dec]* 77
  Maslyukov Hails Ryzhkov Program *[Moscow TV]* 78
  Cites U.S. Disappointment *[TASS]* 78
Abalkin, Others Comment on Government Program *[TASS]* 79
Analyst Views Government Economic Program *[Orlov on TASS]* 79

Political & Social

Lithuanian Party Congress Opens 19 Dec *[Moscow TV]* 81
  'Stormy' Congress Reported *[TASS]* 81
Vilnius Radio Carries 19 Dec Lithuanian Congress 82
  0800 GMT 82
Brazauskas Address at Lithuanian Congress *[PRAVDA 20 Dec]* 84
  Further on Brazauskas Report *[TASS]* 85
PRAVDA Report on Sakharov Ceremonies *[19 Dec]* 86
Kryuchkov Tells Newswomen Sakharov Exile 'Mistake' *[TASS]* 87
Rukh Holds First Campaign Rally in Kiev *[PRAVDA 8 Dec]* 87
Opposition Figure Views Ukrainian Perestroyka *[Warsaw GAZETA WYBORCZA 6 Dec]* 89
General Procuratorate Official on Moldavia Unrest *[SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA 19 Nov]* 90
United Workers Front's View of Elections *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 2 Dec]* 92
Azerbaijan Council of Elders Established *[Baku Radio]* 93
Use of Azeri Language Said 'Unsatisfactory' *[Baku Radio]* 93
Azerbaijan Animal Husbandry 'Backwardness' Noted *[Baku Radio]* 94

Azerbaijan Supreme Soviet Views Economic Plan *[Baku Radio]* ... 94
Armenian Committee Set Up for Repatriates *[Yerevan Radio]* ... 94
Muslim Clergy To Be Trained for 'Harmony' *[IZVESTIYA 21 Nov]* ... 95
Baykal Region Economic Paper Published *[Moscow Radio]* ... 95
Sverdlovsk Convict's 'Token' Fast Described *[TASS]* ... 95
Biryukova on Light Industry's Independence *[Moscow TV]* ... 95
Biryukova, Others Attend Soiree Honoring Author *[Moscow TV]* ... 96
Deputies, Others View Draft Press Law *[SOVETSKAYA KULTURA 9 Dec]* ... 96
Draft Basic Legislation on Land Published *[PRAVDA 6 Dec]* ... 101
MVD Report on Crime Statistics Viewed *[IZVESTIYA 16 Nov]* ... 110
Conference on Organized Crime, Drug Trafficking *[TASS]* ... 111
Turkmenistan's Foreign Affairs Role Examined *[TURKMENSKAYA ISKRA 2 Nov]* ... 112
Aganbegyan on Perestroyka, Economy *[Buenos Aires CLARIN 14 Dec]* ... 114
Commission Member Views Special Privileges *[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 49]* ... 116
Writer Bemoans 'Deculturalization' of People *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 16 Dec]* ... 117
Influenza Epidemic Hits Moscow, Other Cities *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 17 Dec]* ... 120

Economic

Report on Moscow Railmen's Conference *[IZVESTIYA 7 Dec]* ... 120
Goods Continue To Clog Estonian Ports, Rails *[Moscow GUDOK 1 Nov]* ... 122
Albakin Stresses Need for Radical Economic Reform *[Prague Radio]* ... 123
Official Outlines Anti-Inflation Measures *[TASS]* ... 123

Scientific

Cargo Rocket 'Progress M-2' To Dock With Mir ... 124
    20 Dec Launching *[TASS]* ... 124
    Further Details *[TASS]* ... 124
Orbital Observatory 'Granat' Continues Mission *[TASS]* ... 124

Spread of Missile Technology Discussed

PM1912190189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Dec 89 Second Edition p 4

[Vl. Kuznetsov article under the rubric "Discussion Platform": "Some Missiles for Scrap. But Others?"]

[Text] Our stormy world is changing from day to day. Nevertheless, it quickly gets used to everything. The unusual becomes usual. Yet the sight of human hands destroying the most modern and sophisticated missiles, which they themselves created, is an outstanding event notwithstanding. Only recently such a thing seemed like a fantasy.

But today we are witnessing real nuclear disarmament in action, the elimination of Soviet and U.S. intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles.

But thoughts are willy-nilly already turned to something else. To the fact that there are still more terrible missiles—strategic, intercontinental missiles. Will the same fate befall them as that prepared for their "younger sisters?" The work in Geneva on a Soviet-U.S. agreement to reduce strategic offensive arms by half is in full swing, and millions of eyes are expectantly following it. There are also tactical nuclear missiles, which, despite their more "modest" parameters, could cause a great calamity in Europe. There is no change as yet on the question of reducing them, but a debate is taking place on this topic—a fact of considerable significance in itself.

However, there will not be complete security, stability, or peace in the world while the arms race, which is being or could be dammed in some directions, is spreading in others. Including the so-called "side" channels. What do I mean?

Until recently only a few powers were members of the "missile club." Today at least 15 states aspire to a seat in it. They are mainly "Third World" countries located in zones of present or potential conflicts. The missiles in these unstable zones are already becoming a means of waging war, and they were used on the Iran-Iraq front, for example.

No other region of the planet is in the grip of missile fever to such a degree as the Near East.

Back in 1961 Israel launched its first missile. In 1987 it tested the "Jericho-2" missile, whose range makes it possible in principle to strike at the capitals of the majority of Arab states and even at southern Soviet cities. In the fall of 1988 the first Israeli satellite was put into orbit with the help of a Shavit [name as transliterated] carrier, which is classed as an ICBM and can be adapted to deliver a nuclear warhead. Israel has an arsenal of U.S. Lance surface-to-surface missiles. According to USSR Defense Ministry data, a ballistic missile with a range of 1,300 km was launched from the Jerusalem region in September. It is Tel Aviv that has become the epicenter of the missile epidemic in the Near East.

According to foreign press data, Saudi Arabia has purchased a consignment of Chinese intermediate-range missiles. Kuwait, Libya (which has Soviet-made short-range missiles called Scud and is conducting joint developments with Brazil to create missiles with a range of 600 km), and also Iran, which is manufacturing its own tactical missile and a missile with a range of 800 km utilizing Chinese technology, would also like to possess these Chinese missiles. In the spring of this year Tehran tested a new surface-to-surface missile with a range of 200 km. Iraq is cooperating with both Libya and Brazil to create a missile with a range of 300 km. Syria has Scud missiles in its arsenal in addition to SS-21's. Egypt possesses several types of imported missiles as well as its own. Jointly with Argentina it is developing a missile system known by the name of Condor-2 (a potential counterweight to the Israeli Jericho-2).

A modification of Jericho-2 was tested this summer on a range in the Republic of South Africa. Its range of 1,500 km enables it to hit targets on the territories of neighboring states. According to reports from Western sources, South Africa and Israel have also conducted the first joint tests of strategic missiles.

As General Mirza Aslam Beg, chief of staff of Pakistan's ground forces, declared recently, in January-February 1988 his country conducted tests of two types of missiles with ranges of 80 km and 300 km. Pakistan has purchased a consignment of ballistic missiles from China.

The first test launch of the Agni [name as transliterated] missile with a range of up to 2,500 km was carried out in India in May 1989. The commissioning of various tactical missiles is drawing near.

South Korea has improved the U.S. Nike Hercules missiles by increasing their range.

These are the individual brush strokes making up the overall picture. Everything in it has gotten mixed up as a result of numerous bilateral and multilateral missile projects, including ICBM's.

A universal passion for missiles is in evidence. There are more than enough carriers of various types. But what kind of charges are they designed for, and what can they be equipped with? The Negev Desert has sheltered a secret Israeli nuclear installation. The nuclear research complexes at Valendaba [name as transliterated] and Pelindaba are hidden in South Africa's Transvaal Province, and there is a test range in the Kalahari Desert. A Pakistani nuclear center is concealed in deserted hills at Kahuta, near Rawalpindi. It is in precisely these complexes that preparations are being made to cross the "nuclear threshold." Perhaps it has already been crossed in some places. There are many guesses and suppositions on this score, as well as computations, calculations, and evidence.

When we speak of a "major" war, it usually occurs to us that it might flare up between the USSR and the United States. Or in Europe. But the threat of such a conflict has now been set aside and is becoming less likely. On the other hand, there are ever-increasing grounds for concern that the irremediable might happen in the "third world."

Universal attention is now turned to the talks in Geneva and Vienna. It is right there, it is believed, that historic decisions must be adopted which will halt the slide toward a nuclear auto-da-fe. This is undoubtedly so. But other potential hotbeds of danger must not be underestimated either. This is the very time to place under unremitting control all vulnerable spots on the global strategic landscape, all points and regions of risk. The spread of missiles and missile technology is becoming a most acute problem for the world community. Moreover, one of the problems connected with mankind's survival.

It cannot be said to be entirely outside the field of view of governments and states. The first Soviet-U.S. consultations on this range of questions have taken place. In April 1987 the United States, Britain, France, the FRG, Italy, Canada, and Japan reached agreement on limiting the transfer to other countries of technologies and equipment which contribute to the development of unmanned nuclear weapon delivery systems. It was undoubtedly a timely and useful agreement, although the number of parties to it could be wider, and resourceful firms and slick operators very often circumvent the agreement itself.

Yet, in my view, more vigorous efforts are needed to neutralize the threat. Above all, efforts by the five nuclear powers, but also by the United Nations and other international organizations. The Treaty on the Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons was signed in 1968. Despite all the complexities of its realization, it serves its proclaimed aims well. This is undoubtedly an example also for the establishment of reliable obstacles to the "missile epidemic."

The Soviet Union believes that the problem of the proliferation of missile weapons and their transfer to zones of heightened confrontation is ripe for discussion on both a bilateral and a multilateral level. It is complex: It is necessary, on the one hand, to stop the geographic spread of combat missiles and the attendant technology and, on the other, not to infringe the legitimate interests of countries which seek to secure peaceful access to space. Nevertheless, it seems that even now there are real possibilities of ending the practice of unlimited and uncontrolled international weapons deliveries. It is best to resolve this problem, like others, in light of glasnost and openness. The USSR is ready, in particular, to participate in the creation at the United Nations of a register of sales and deliveries of weapons, including drawing up its parameters.

As for the United States, it can unfortunately in no way rid itself of contradictoriness and duplicity in its position. Both the president and the secretary of state campaign in many speeches for "strengthening the regime of control over missile hardware." At the same time Washington is arming the Afghan opposition with Stingers, supplying Pakistan with F-16 aircraft, which are easily adapted for transporting nuclear warheads, and creating a ballistic missile together with Israel.

According to CIA forecasts, by the year 2000 at least 15 countries will be producing ballistic missiles. Washington asserts that it is very concerned at this and intends to block such trends. From time to time it makes representations to other countries from where leaks of missile technology and weapons component equipment occur in roundabout ways, with the help of straw men. And Washington itself? As THE WALL STREET JOURNAL reported in August this year, the Senate Governmental Affairs Committee had to enquire into three very important military laboratories—Los Alamos, Livermore, and Sandy—from where, it is believed, countries working on secret programs to create nuclear weapons had obtained secret information.

The spread of missiles in zones of instability and tension could seriously hamper and even undermine the process which has begun of settling regional conflicts. Further real nuclear disarmament could also be complicated. Because, if more and more states acquire missiles, it cannot be ruled out that people will have to give the matter some thought: Under these conditions should we scrap our own?

We are now driving missile weapons out of the door, but this monster is threatening to climb back in through the windows which remain without reliable surveillance in various parts of the globe.

It is known to be easier to cure any disease before it is allowed to develop unchecked.

TASS Reports Perfilyev Press Briefing 20 Dec

Czechoslovkia's Calfa Visit

LD1912154389 Moscow TASS in English 1451 GMT 19 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 19 TASS—The Soviet Union regards Czechoslovak Prime Minister Marian Calfa's visit to the Soviet Union, forthcoming on December 20, as the continuation of the long tradition of cooperation between the two countries, a Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman said at a news briefing today.

Vadim Perfilyev said the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia "are drawn together not only by their geographic proximity but also by diverse political, economic and cultural ties and friendly relations between their peoples."

The spokesman said Calfa and Soviet officials will discuss bilateral relations, specifically ways to improve their economic ties and solve the economic problems that have accumulated, and topical international issues.

Trade Agreement With EC

LD1912184289 Moscow TASS in English 1627 GMT 19 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 19 TASS—It is held in the Soviet Union that the agreement on trade and commercial and economic cooperation between the Soviet Union and the European Communities is an event of major importance in European politics.

Soviet Foreign Ministry Spokesman Vadim Perfilyev told this at a briefing in Moscow regarding the importance of the document signed on behalf of the Soviet Government on December 18 by Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze during his visit to Belgium.

Perfilyev said the agreement is the broadest ever concluded by the European Communities.

Noting that the Communities pledge themselves to lift curbs on the volumne of import from the USSR, curbs of a discriminatory character, the spokesman noted that the agreement does not envisage similar obligations of the Soviet side, as the Soviet Union has never imposed such restrictions for member-countries of the Communities.

In accordance with the provisions of the fundamental documents determining the development of the all-European process, the Soviet Union expressed the readiness to take measures to improve the conditions of work in the USSR for businessmen from member-countries of the European Communities, the spokesman said.

It was pointed out that the wording of the agreement approaches the wording used by GATT. The spokesman emphasised that this approach reflects the Soviet Union's intention to be integrated in international economic cooperation.

Chilean Elections

LD1912185689 Moscow TASS in English 1623 GMT 19 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 19 TASS—General elections in Chile were undoubtedly of much importance in the political life of that Latin American country. Its importance transcends national boundaries. Soviet Foreign Ministry Spokesman Vadim Perfilyev told this a briefing in Moscow today.

Asked by a TASS diplomatic correspondent about the assessment of general elections in Chile by the Soviet people and about how that event might influence Soviet-Chilean relations, the spokesman said that the elections attest to the Chilean people's resolve to revive democracy and become masters of their destiny.

An important step toward the assertion of constitutional rights and liberties has been taken.

He said the Soviet people sincerely congratulate the friendly Chilean people on this success scored due to the consolidation of all the patriotic forces. He noted that Soviet people wish the Chilean people to complete the process of democratisation which, as it is hoped, has become irreversible.

The spokesman said that being guided by the principles of new political thinking the Soviet Union declares for a constructive dialogue and fruitful development of relations with all countries, for profound transformations in relations among peoples on the basis of humanism, common human values and solidarity. The Soviet Union is guided by this approach also with regard to Chile, he said.

Perfilyev said that the message of congratulations sent on behalf of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet to Chilean President- elect Patricio Aylwin Azocar expresses the confidence that the restoration of good relations between the two countries would suit the interests of the Soviet and Chilean consolidation of peace and international cooperation.

U.S.-Soviet Relations, Naval Arms

LD1912191889 Moscow TASS in English 1729 GMT 19 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 19 TASS—At a press briefing here today, Soviet Foreign Ministry Spokesman Vadim Perfilyev pointed to former U.S. Defence Minister Robert MacNamara's statement that "President Gorbachev offered us the greatest opportunity in forty years to shift the determination of U.S. foreign and military policies from thinking in cold war categories to an entirely new vision of relations between the two superpowers".

The Soviet spokesman said these words expressed both conceptual thinking and a call to act. "We are happy to note," he said, "that calls of this kind are increasingly in accordance with the approach of U.S. official community".

Recalling the recent U.S. State Department publication about the state and perspectives for the development of Soviet-American relations, Perfilyev said, "one cannot but agree that vast historic opportunities are presenting themselves to achieve a progressive and substantial improvement in Soviet-American relations. We welcome and share these assessments".

"The State Department document was prepared, as far as we understand, before the Malta summit and is in the same vein as Eduard Shevardnadze's recent interview with the CBS Television Network.

"The Soviet foreign minister spoke about the readiness of our country to discard earlier prevailing views on Soviet-American relations as relations of eternal rivals. 'New trust' must prevail in relations between the two great powers under conditions of greater stability, predictability and openness."

Stressing that such trust is facilitated by the U.S. Defence Ministry's announcement that U.S. Armed Forces will be cut by 46,000 men in the new fiscal year, the Soviet spokesman pointed out that these cuts "will leave intact the naval personnel—in the spirit of Washington's unwillingness to regulate naval arms."

"However," he said, "new type relations imply the reduction of the level of military confrontation in all directions, including naval".

U.S. Statement on Naval Talks

LD1912195189 Moscow TASS in English 1926 GMT 19 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 19 TASS—U.S. Chief of naval operations Admiral Carlisle A.H. Trost issued a statement against talks with the Soviet Union on the reduction of naval forces. "There is nothing original in the statement," Soviet Foreign Ministry Spokesman Vadim Perfilyev told a press briefing here today, commenting on the admiral's recent interview with the AP News Agency.

The Soviet spokesman cited Trost as saying that the United States needed a strong Navy in order to intimidate the Soviet Union and because the world had many countries that were not friendly towards the United Stataes.

Trost's pronouncements do not fit the dynamics of relations between the Soviet Union and the United States and East-West relations in general, Perfilyev said.

They reveal the U.S. Navy's parochial concern that, following the Malta summit, Soviet-U.S. relations can proceed beyond the 'containment boundaries' and head towards building a qualitatively new level of interaction, Perfilyev said.

"If events keep developing in this direction, it will be impossible to leave the naval issue outside of disarmament negotiations. This is obviously what troubles the American admiral" the Soviet spokesman stressed.

Perfilyev recalled that the Soviet Union was already carrying out unilateral cuts of its naval forces and proposes that the two countries should begin negotiations on naval issues.

Romanian Events

LD1912211989 Moscow TASS in English 2039 GMT 19 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 19 TASS—The address of Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev to visitors of the Soviet mobile exhibition, "USSR: perestroyka", which opened on Monday in Orlando, Florida, has found a positive response in mass media, Soviet Foreign Ministry Spokesman Vadim Perfilyev told a briefing today.

The Soviet Union believes that the agreement on trade and commercial and economic cooperation between the Soviet Union and the European Communities is an event of major importance in European politics, said Perfilyev in regard to the importance of the document signed on behalf of the Soviet Government on December 18 by Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze during his visit to Belgium.

He also informed journalists about Shevardnadze's visit today to the NATO headquarters and his talk with NATO Secretary General Manfred Woerner.

The Soviet Union regards Czechoslovak Prime Minister Marian Calfa's working visit to the Soviet Union, forthcoming on December 20, as the continuation of the long tradition of cooperation between the two countries.

The spokesman said Calfa and Soviet officials will discuss bilateral relations, specifically ways to improve their economic ties and solve the economic problems that have accumulated.

Answering journalists' questions about the recent developments in Romania, Perfilyev stressed that "a lot of contradictory information is now being spread about this country. This sometimes prevents us from having a full picture of the developments."

Touching upon processes in Romania and other socialist countries, he said that the Soviet Union proceeds from the idea that their regulation is the cause of only their peoples, parties and public organisations.

Romanian official bodies have announced that due to unfavorable weather conditions, the absence of snow in the mountains and changed terms of schoolchildren and student vacations, the Romanian tourist bureau Carpat suspended the admission of Soviet tourists for vacation.

"We also have information about Soviet citizens encountering difficulties when entering Romania on personal affairs," said Perfilyev.

Perfilyev confirmed that a Congress of Soviet Jewish organisations, attended by foreign guests, is underway in Moscow. But he refused to confirm the words of a journalist who claimed that the Congress is attended by two advisers of Shim'on Peres. Perfilyev stressed that he does not have a list of the Congress' foreign guests.

Foreign Ministry Statement on UN Apartheid Session

LD1912205689 Moscow TASS in English 2023 GMT 19 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 19 TASS—The Soviet Foreign Ministry has issued a statement on the results of the U.N. General Assembly special session on apartheid. The statement says:

"From December 12-14 1989,the U.N. General Assembly held a special session on apartheid and its destructive consequences in southern Africa.

"The session, convened at the initiative of non-aligned countries, took place amid renewal processes that are gaining strength under the influence of new political thinking and that have affected all spheres of international relations.

"This atmosphere predetermined the orientation of the session's work and the emphasis on political methods for solving problems in southern Africa.

"The session confirmed the international community's opposition to apartheid and its resolute denunciation of the Pretoria government's racist policy.

"The session, which passed a declaration on apartheid and its destructive consequences in southern Africa by consensus, was the first in U.N. history to achieve a united platform and formulate a common approach to the problem of dismantling apartheid.

"The unanimous approval of the final document provides a new dimension to the U.N. role in settling regional conflicts.

"The results of the special session clearly demonstrate that consensus is becoming an important means of solving difficult international problems and ensuring stability in conditions of change. It is creating the sole reasonable political alternative to military methods of settling conflicts.

"The achievement of generally acceptable accords at the special session became possible due to the interested interaction of all U.N. members and the constructive stand of African countries and the African National Congress of South Africa.

"The Soviet Union is satisfied that the declaration on apartheid, adopted at the session and oriented to the future, offers an impressive programme of action, the implementation of which will help fully eliminate the vestiges of racism and apartheid in southern Africa.

"The Soviet Union also expresses readiness to do everything possible to promote the declaration's implementation."

West Seen 'Nurturing Schemes' in East Europe

LD1612210889 Moscow World Service in English 1210 GMT 16 Dec 89

[Aleksandr Pogodin commentary]

[Text] The development of events in Eastern Europe have attracted the close attention of the mass media, the world's public, and politicians. The flow of information, assessments, and forecasts is increasing. More on this from our commentator Aleksandr Pogodin.

I have no intention of casting doubt upon the evaluation of processes taking place in Eastern Europe. The essence of these processes is democratization and renovation of socialism. They are a result of internal developments, a result of choice made by the people. The Soviet Union proceeds from the assumption that each nation has the right to decide its destiny on its own. With reference to processes launched in Eastern Europe, President Mikhail Gorbachev has said we welcome the positive changes and fully realize internal and international complications accompanying them.

All this is indisputable. Nevertheless, I'd like to touch upon some disquieting aspects. It should be taken into account that the development of events has been influenced by different political forces: Forces supporting socialist ideals and those who look for other ways of social development. All this is natural and normal, but only when there are no attempts to use the process of democratization and strengthening pluralism and the (?pursuit) of exactly opposite goals.

This has to be mentioned, since some Western countries, despite their declarations of noninterference, are seeking to use the processes underway in Eastern Europe in their own selfish political interests. For instance, they make no secret of the fact that the dimensions of economic aid to East European nations will depend on how close each of them get to the Western standards of political democracy.

The far right political circles are also nurturing schemes. For example, in West Germany a neo-nazi grouping, the so-called Republican Party, has announced its intentions to set up in the German Democratic Republic a network of this organization, and nominate candidates for next year's parliamentary elections. These and other facts should be brought into correlation with the activity of extremist forces in some East European countries.

Some events cannot be explained solely by the heat of political passions. On Wednesday, for example, there were a number of demonstrations in different Polish cities, which were accompanied by hooliganism and political and government institutions, and desecration of monuments. I do not wish either to dramatise the situation or make gloomy forecasts. Nevertheless I believe that there are reasons to feel anxiety and concern in connection with the attempt to distort the processes of democratization in evidence in Eastern Europe. But all these observations are of purely personal nature, said Aleksandr Pogodin in conclusion.

United States & Canada

Further Reportage on Bush-Mitterrand Talks

IZVESTIYA Details Talks

PM1912151389 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 11

[Own correspondent Yu. Kovalenko dispatch under the rubric "Panorama of International Events": "Meeting on the Island of Saint Martin"]

[Text] Paris—A meeting has taken place between F. Mitterrand and G. Bush on the tiny island of Saint Martin in the Caribbean, which is divided between France and the Netherlands.

The French and U.S. presidents devoted their main attention to events in the socialist countries, the German question, U.S. relations with Western Europe, and NATO's role in the new international situation.

During the news conference at the end of the talks, the two heads of state noted the coincidence or proximity of their stands on virtually every question discussed. They spoke out in support of the democratic reforms taking place in Eastern Europe, noting that these transformations must not be made too quickly, as this could lead to the destabilization of the situation on the Old Continent.

The two heads of state devoted particular attention to the German question. If the unification of the two Germanys does take place, they stressed, then this must only be within the framework of strict observance of existing treaties and agreements stipulating the inviolability of borders. This unification, Mitterrand believes, must not impede West European integration processes.

Bush confirmed the United States' intention of maintaining its military presence in Europe and sustaining close contacts with its West European allies. Gorbachev, the U.S. President said at the news conference, recognizes the role which the United States must play in creating a "common European home." For his part, Mitterrand stressed the importance of the CSCE in the U.S. dialogue with Europe.

At the same time, observers note that France is reacting very cautiously to the latest U.S. idea, set out recently in West Berlin by Baker, on "a new architecture" for Europe, which envisages active U.S. involvement in European affairs and, in particular, the conclusion of an agreement between the United States and the EC. France, LIBERATION writes, fears increased influence by Washington in the European Community, of which the United States would essentially be the 13th member. This kind of evolution, it is believed on the banks of the Seine, could radically change the nature of the EC and lead to a weakening of France's positions.

At his meeting with Bush, Mitterrand agreed to further consider the U.S. proposal for the evolution of NATO. "As the danger of a conflict arising between the two blocs has been considerably reduced," the French president said, "the essence of the North Atlantic alliance must also change."

All these problems, and also Moscow's new initiative for the withdrawal of Soviet troops from East European countries, were touched on at the meeting on the island of Saint Martin. To all appearances, the stand taken by France and other West European countries regarding the latest U.S. proposals will be determined during the forthcoming consultations and, in particular, at the talks between Mitterrand and Kohl planned for 4 January 1990.

PRAVDA Report

PM1912133989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Dec 89 Second Edition p 5

[Vladimir Bolshakov dispatch under the rubric "Correspondents' Comment": "Positions Defined"]

[Text] Paris—The meeting between U.S. President G. Bush and President F. Mitterrand of France in a "corner of paradise"—the idyllic island of Saint Martin in the Caribbean—has finished.

Their 3-hour talks were mainly devoted to the future political structure of Europe. President Mitterrand spoke not only on behalf of France but also, in his capacity as EC chairman, on behalf of all "Common Market" countries and the United States' West European partners in NATO.

The fact that the meeting in the Antilles was held literally a few days after Bush's meeting with NATO leaders in Brussels, whom he briefed on the Soviet-U.S. talks in Malta, and also following the meeting of "Common Market" heads of state and government in Strasbourg, attracted many people's attention. But both presidents reaffirmed their support for the scenario for the development of events in Europe which was unanimously supported in Strasbourg recently, namely an initial unification of Europe on the basis of the Treaty of Rome, which would be followed by the unification of Germany provided this is the will of the peoples of the FRG and the GDR, which are sovereign states belonging to different military-political alliances. It is highly important that a reminder to this effect was issued prior to [FRG Chancellor] H. Kohl's forthcoming visit to Paris 4 January next year.

Regarding the U.S. role in a new Europe, the U.S. and French presidents have different visions of it. Judging by everything, Bush suggested to Mitterrand the Baker Doctrine, which has been dubbed "the new Atlanticism." The essence of the U.S. secretary of state's doctrine boils down to politicizing NATO with due consideration for the changes occurring in Europe and the progress in the disarmament sphere, and enabling the United States "to speak in a single voice with West Europe" in all talks with the rest of the world. The newspaper LE FIGARO correctly asks in this context in its leading article today: Is this not a new version of U.S. leadership of the Atlantic alliance? And is a united Europe, as EC Commission Chairman J. Delors says, not likely to become the European mainstay of this alliance one fine day?

Mitterrand, bearing in mind the clearly expressed desire of the leaders of the future "united Europe" for greater autonomy and independence from Washington's diktat, responded with extreme caution to the Baker Doctrine presented to him. He restricted himself to a statement that some thought must be given to the future of the alliances. The French president emphasized the special importance of the Helsinki process in Europe.

TASS Views Bush Comments on Arms Reductions

LD1912210989 Moscow TASS in English 2031 GMT 19 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 19 TASS—By TASS military writer Vladimir Chernyshev:

In an interview with correspondents of Western news agencies, U.S. President George Bush said that the United States is determined to advance conventional arms reductions in Europe. He also expressed the hope that a treaty on U.S. and Soviet strategic offensive arms will be signed at the Soviet-American summit next year.

The U.S. President's stand encourages optimism about the process of disarmament becoming permanent and stability and mutual confidence strengthening.

The U.S. President also stated that, like Mikhail Gorbachev, he will press for arrangements on a broad range of arms control issues.

However, the range addressed by the U.S. Administration is not very broad, and in this sense Washington clearly lags behind Moscow and the demands of reality.

It is, certainly, a welcome fact that strategic offensive arms, conventional armaments in Europe and chemical weapons are on the U.S. agenda.

As regards nuclear weapons, the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles has been concluded and is being successfully implemented. A treaty on 50 per cent cuts in strategic offensive arms is about to be concluded. But tactical nuclear weapons have not yet been included in negotiations.

Is it justifiable to leave them aside, as a conclusion of the agreement on conventional armaments in Europe draws near?

Another Soviet proposal concerning nuclear disarmament has also not received the U.S. support: the proposal to conduct negotiations to terminate the production of fissionable materials used to manufacture of nuclear weapons. At present there are favourable conditions for achieving such an arrangement.

The U.S. Administration has not responded positively to the Soviet call. Moreover, it is advancing a large-scale programme to create a new technological basis for the manufacture of fissionable materials.

Naval forces play an ever more important role in the strategic balance between the Soviet Union and the United States, between the Warsaw Treaty Organisation and NATO.

The Soviet Union is pressing to open an international dialogue on scaling down military confrontation on the high seas. The USSR has made a number of proposals to start a discussion of naval topics in order to achieve practical realisable arrangements.

These efforts have failed to achieve results, mainly because the U.S. does not want to conduct any negotiations on the subject.

Washington officials are clearly inconsistent about another important issue.

Representatives of U.S. leaders talk a lot about the menace to universal peace posed by regional conflicts.

Meanwhile, the U.S. is not striving to use every opportunity to neutralise this menace.

Nothing is being done to place reliable barriers to the spread of nuclear weapons.

It is time to discuss the spread of missiles to zones of enhanced confrontation on bilateral and multilateral levels.

The Soviet Union holds that there is every opportunity to stop unlimited and uncontrolled arms supplies.

This problem, just as any other, can best be solved in the atmosphere of openness.

For this purpose, the Soviet Union expressed the readiness to participate in the creation at the United Nations of a register of arms sales and supplies. Washington has not yet advanced any proposals on this matter.

China

PRC 'Intensified Border Surveillance'

OW1912185189 Moscow in Mandarin to Southeast Asia 1200 GMT 19 Dec 89

[Text] A spokesman for the Public Security Ministry in Beijing told reporters that China has intensified border surveillance in order to prevent people from leaving the country with fake passports, visas, or by other illegal means.

He said: Some people, who for various reasons were unable to obtain the documents needed to leave the country, have tried to leave China illegally. Some 400 such cases have been uncovered so far this year.

PRAVDA Cites Improvement in PRC Relations

OW1712134489 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1400 GMT 8 Dec 89

[Text] Listeners: Many people in our country would like to know what changes have taken place in the relations between the two parties of the Soviet Union and China since Gorbachev's visit to China last spring. PRAVDA's commentator (Kurusunechin) discussed this issue in an article in that paper:

I remember that 1 year ago I had a chance to take part in a meeting between two party committee secretaries. One was (Tuinov), secretary of a village on the Soviet border, and the other was (Jin Yici) of (Zhonghe) City. [words indistinct]

At that time, Soviet-Chinese relations had not yet been normalized, but as complicated problems of cooperation between the two countries' border areas would be difficult to solve without the participation of party leaders, the meeting had to be arranged.

Now party leaders of cities, prefectures, and oblasts can meet any time to discuss cooperation matters. This means that many problems can be solved more effectively and in a timely manner. Both sides have expressed the desire to exchange party work experience at the party central committee and local level and to discuss matters of developing party's scientific research institutes.

Jiang Zemin, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China [CPC], said at a press conference in September: The prospects for cooperation between the two parties of China and the Soviet Union and between the two countries are good.

A CPC delegation led by Zhu Liang, director of the International Liaison Department of the CPC Central Committee, paid a visit to the Soviet Union in September this year. The exchange of reporters between PRAVDA and RENMIN RIBAO, organs of the Central Committees of the two parties, is also very important.

The principle for developing relations between the two parties, formulated during Gorbachev's visit to China, is particularly important. The principle is the first item in the Joint Soviet-Chinese Communique: Both China and the Soviet Union have agreed that the CPSU and the CPC will make contact and carry out exchanges in accordance with the principle of independence, equality, mutual respect, and mutual noninterference in each other's internal affairs.

Northeast Asia

Further Reportage on Peace Talks With Japan

Rogachev Holds News Conference

OW1912140889 Tokyo KYODO in English 1328 GMT 19 Dec 89

[Text] Tokyo, Dec. 19 KYODO—Soviet Vice Foreign Minister Igor Rogachev on Tuesday expressed his hope that Japan will eventually reconsider its opposition to a Soviet proposal that for each side come up with drafts for a belated peace treaty by early next year.

"Indeed, Japan expressed doubts as to how appropriate an exchange of peace treaty drafts would be," Rogachev told reporters. "But we strongly hope that that is not Japan's final stance."

Rogachev spoke at a press conference at the Soviet Embassy on the third day of his visit to Japan as leader of the Soviet delegation to a working-level meeting on reaching a bilateral peace treaty.

The meeting took place on Monday without tangible progress, with the Soviets calling on their Japanese counterparts to heed the results of World War II and halt "groundless" claims to territory allegedly ceded to Moscow at the Yalta Conference in 1945.

For more than four decades the two countries have been embroiled in a dispute over three northern islands and a group of islets occupied by the Soviets at the end of World War II.

Rogachev said that to make the peace treaty discussions more constructive and concrete, the Soviets proposed that both sides prepare peace treaty drafts and compare them at the next working group meeting.

He strongly denied that the proposal was a Soviet attempt to shelve the territorial issue. "Where and by whom was it ever said that geographical matters would not enter into the drafts?" he said.

But the Soviet vice minister, alluding to Japan's persistent focus on the territorial issue, stressed that the mission of the peace treaty working groups is contained in their title.

"They are not 'territorial dispute' working groups," he said.

Regarding Soviet Politburo member Alexandr Yakovlev's mention in Tokyo recently of "a third way" of improving Japan-Soviet relations through constructive dialogue, Rogachev said, "I think Mr Yakovlev said what he wanted to say."

Some political observers believed Yakovlev's specific reference to the working groups in relation to his "third way" might have signaled a new Soviet initiative to resolve the territorial issue during the current round of talks in Tokyo.

But Rogachev stressed that the working group forum is a standing mechanism which should mark progress toward its goal "step by step." "The road we must travel is long and both sides must exert great efforts," he said.

He said that while the two sides are no closer to resolving their differences over the issue of border demarcation, the "justness" of the Soviet position was made clearer through "powerful arguments" based on history, geography and international law.

On the Japanese Government's claims that Moscow has not shown new political resolve in the Asia-Pacific region, Rogachev said the view "conflicts with reality."

He said that the Soviet Union has attempted many unilateral steps to lower military tension in the region, such as its spurned proposal for regional military talks with Japan and the United States.

Welcoming indications from Japan that it is serious about wanting to improve ties, Rogachev said it would be a mistake to conclude that Japan-Soviet relations are at a standstill.

He noted the steady pace of cooperation in the areas of environment, science and technology, and trade.

But he said that current ties are insufficient, especially when compared with Moscow's blossoming relations with other countries in the West.

Continuation of Talks Necessary

OW1912141189 Tokyo KYODO in English 1331 GMT 19 Dec 89

[Text] Tokyo, Dec. 19 KYODO - Soviet Vice Foreign Minister Igor Rogachev wound up a series of meetings with high-ranking Japanese officials here Tuesday, agreeing with them on the necessity to continue working-level talks for a peace treaty, Foreign Ministry officials said.

Rogachev told Foreign Minister Taro Nakayama that the latest round of the talks on the conclusion of a peace treaty was instructive, although not so much progress was made as expected, the officials said.

Noting that the Soviet Union looks at the working-level talks in a larger and more comprehensive context, Rogachev agreed that promotion of overall bilateral Japan-Soviet relations may have a favorable impact on the outcome of the working-level talks.

He told Nakayama that the Soviet Union hopes to elevate bilateral relations to a higher level through the promotion of relations in various spheres, according to the officials.

Nakayama said the working discussions should continue until both sides are satisfied with what each side has to say and confidence is firmly built.

In a meeting with Japanese Vice Foreign Minister Takakazu Kuriyama, Rogachev said that both nations should be well-prepared for the scheduled visit to Japan by Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze next March because the visit will mark an important phase in bilateral relations.

Kuriyama agreed that they must strive harder to set up a stable foundation for bilateral relations in preparing for the visit.

Meeting with his counterpart Hisashi Owada, Rogachev said Japan was a priority nation in Soviet foreign policy aimed at promoting goodneighborly relations on all the continents and easing of tension.

Owada and Rogachev agreed to patiently proceed with the working-level talks in the future.

Hokkaido Police Arrest Crew for Joint Fishing

OW1712044589 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 9 Dec 89

[Announcer-read report filed by PRAVDA Tokyo correspondent Latyshev: "Arrest in Hokkaido"]

[Text] In connection with the report that the Hokkaido police use intimidation to suppress local residents who make proposals for business cooperation with the Soviet Union, Correspondent Latyshev writes as follows:

A few days ago, the police in Kushiro arrested the 12-member crew of "Shinpaku Maru No. 2", a fishing boat, and its captain, Masato Otomo. We have information indicating attempts at suppression of activities, saying that the police have arrested President Shiiki and Finance Department Chief Kajiwara of Utabe Kyodo Company, the company that leased the fishing boat.

Why did the police decide to arrest these people? The fact is that President Shiiki signed a contract with the leading executives of (Aniwa), a Soviet-Japanese joint venture, in Yuzhno Sakhalinsk on 4 October. The contract concerns cooperation in joint crab fishing within the Soviet economic waters of the southern Kurile Islands. In accordance with this contract, Utabe Kyodo is responsible for sending its processing ship to the crab fishing waters, while the Soviet-Japanese joint venture, (Aniwa), is responsible for supplying this processing ship with a certain amount of crabs as raw material every day.

Based on this contract, the two sides can participate in joint crab fishing within the Soviet economic waters. The joint operation occured when Utabe Kyodo sent "Kinpaku Maru No. 2" to the coasts of Shikotan Island. The fishing operation was carried out from late October to early November, and "Kinpaku Maru No. 2" returned to the Japanese port loaded with a catch worth 15 million yen. The Japanese police regard this operation as a crime.

According to the police logic, the ships belonging to Utabe Kyodo should not exercise the privilege of crab fishing within the restricted waters approved by the Soviet Union. Why not? It is because the Japanese Government regards the four Kurile Islands and the waters surrounding these islands as Japanese territory, not Soviet.

Correspondent Latyshev adds that this concerns the issue of the Japanese territorial demand to the Soviet Union.

Improved Trade Between ROK, CSSR Reported

SK1812090589 Moscow International Service in Korean 1100 GMT 16 Dec 89

[From the "Focus on Asia" program]

[Text] Czechoslovakia is interested in improving trade relations with the ROK. According to a report from the CTK NEWS AGENCY, in a (?meeting) with Kim Yong-chun, a prominent ROK economist and dean of a faculty in Seoul National University in Praque on Friday [15 December], Czechoslovak Prime Minister Marian Calfa said this. According to the evaluation of diplomats, this was the first high level meeting that a ROK representative has had with the CSSR.

As the international situation has improved recently, the ROK has taken active steps in a bid to develop economic relations with socialist countries.

ROK Businessmen Arrive in Soviet Far East

SK1812091289 Moscow International Service in Korean 0900 GMT 14 Dec 89

[Text] A ROK businessmen's delegation has arrived in Blagovenshchensk, a city in the Soviet Far East region. The delegation will discuss possibilities for practical contact and ways for economic cooperation. ROK-Soviet ties have been effectively developed recently. An exhibition of ROK consumer goods was successfully held in Moscow. The first ROK working team's office has been opened in the Pacific region of the Soviet Union.

Association of Koreans in USSR Holds Meeting

SK1812085989 Moscow International Service in Korean 1100 GMT 16 Dec 89

[From "Asian News" in the "Focus on Asia" program]

[Text] A regular meeting of the cultural association of Koreans in the Soviet Union was held today in Frunze, the capital of the Kirgiz SSR. All Soviet citizens of Korean origin in the Soviet Union are to join this association. The regular meeting will adopt the regulations and platform of the association and will also elect members of the board of directors of the association. The regular meeting will be attended by representatives from the cultural associations of Koreans in the Soviet Union organized in Alma-Ata, Moscow, Tashkent, and other cities.

The cultural association of Koreans in the Soviet Union has the task of recovering and developing their national language and tradition. The national language and tradition of Koreans in the Soviet Union have been very much held back because of the distorted national policies during the Stalin era and during the period thereafter.

DPRK Film Cooperation, Exchanges Discussed

SK1712064489 Moscow International Service in Korean 1100 GMT 7 Dec 89

[Text] A week of Soviet films was observed in November in the DPRK to mark the 72nd anniversary of the Great Socialist October Revolution. Arkadiy Roskin, responsible functionary of the Soviet State Film Committee, who headed a Soviet delegation that attended the film week, is here with us in this program.

[Begin Arkady Roskin recording in Russian fading into Korean translation] First of all, I think I must note that contacts between the film people of the Soviet Union and Korea are beneficiary. This makes it possible for the both sides to get acquainted with each other.

Such Soviet films as "The Last Road," "Tower Clock on the Kremlin," "[name indistinct]," "The Way Father Does Things," and "People I Met on the Subway," were shown during the film week. An opening ceremony for the film week was magnificently held in the International Film Theater in Pyongyang. Attending the opening ceremony were Soviet Ambassador to the DPRK Gennady Bartoshevich, film critic and member of the Soviet delegation Sergey Laurenchev, and Ukrainian actor Larissa Nevaskovskaya.

Kim Chang-tok, vice minister of Culture and Art of the DPRK, expressed his satisfaction over the development of creative ties between the film workers of the two countries, as well as his conviction that the week of showing Soviet films contributes to strengthening the traditional relationship of friendship and cooperation between the Soviet Union.

Soviet films were shown not only in Pyongyang, but also in Chongjin and Sariwon. We also visited Hamhung where the film "The Last Road" was shown. There was also a meeting with spectators.

I would like to say a few words about my impression. Korea is a very beautiful country. I think it is not necessary to say that in that country, the things [words indistinct], and outlandish to us were all interwoven with modern civilization. I have written about this many times. However, the architectural beauty there, the friendliness of the people we met there, and [word indistinct] thrilled us to the extreme. The consulates in which the Soviet films were shown were closely packed in the true sense of the word. This is an expression of great interest in the Soviet people's culture and way of life. [end recording]

[Second announcer] However, in cultural exchange between the film workers of our two countries in particular, [words indistinct]? What else can you do in this area?

[Begin Arkady Roskin recording in Russian fading into Korean translation] I would like to say that in the future the week of Soviet films will be observed on a broader scope. When this happens, residents there will be able to see many more films, including modern films showing today's events in the Soviet Union, when the general film [word indistinct] and leadership of the Soviet film committee and creative functionaries visit the DPRK during the weeks of film showing.

There is no question that the Soviet people would find it greatly interesting to see such films as "Yim Kokchong," "An Order," and "[name indistinct]" that were shown in film theaters in the DPRK. The opinion that films from the socialist countries are not favorably appreciated, which prevailed up until recently, can be discarded after seeing "Honggiltong," a Korean film widely applauded by the audience. [end recording]

Rogachev Meets Australian Counterpart in Tokyo

LD1812055789 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0039 GMT 18 Dec 89

[Text] Tokyo, 18 Dec (TASS)—USSR Deputy Foreign Minister I.A. Rogachev met Australian Deputy Foreign Minister M. Costello in Tokyo on Sunday. During the converstion, prospects for a Cambodian settlement, taking into consideration the initiatives set forth by Australia and other interested states recently, were discussed.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Commentary Welcomes Latest Cambodian Initiative

BK2012055589 Moscow in Cambodian to Cambodia 1230 GMT 19 Dec 89

[Commentary by Station Observer Viktor Valentinov]

[Text] It is well known that a number of countries are currently trying to help promote a speedy settlement of the Cambodian conflict. The leadership of the Cambodian government, in addition to its earlier efforts, recently put forward a new initiative which has become the subject of discussion within political circles in Asia and other regions.

First of all, I wish to raise some points [words indistinct] in order to arrive at a just solution.

It has frequently been said that the conflict should be blamed on the Cambodians themselves. This assumption appears reasonable because, in the Cambodian issue, there have been conflicts of interest among various states and groups of nations. However, in the climate of detente which is having a growing impact on the region, the international community has realized and accepted the inevitable fact that the process of easing the strained situation in Cambodia can never move ahead if it is not sought, meaning the process of settling conflict by mutual concessions. Adhering to this concept, what is obvious today is that the discord is between the Cambodian factions themselves.

I wish to talk about the Phnom Penh government and the military and political alliance of the Cambodian opposition groups. The success or failure of a settlement depends primarily on the readiness of the Cambodian parties to make reciprocal concessions. I never ignore the external impact, but in my view, the major responsibility for the Cambodian settlement should be shouldered by the Cambodian parties themselves. In my view, it is obvious that the conflict is between Cambodians.

The following is the new initiative spelled out by Phnom Penh, which has two significant points:

1. Comrade Prime Minister Hun Sen's government is prepared to hold talks with the Cambodian opposition on the establishment of an international control mechanism [ICM]. The ICM would be able to monitor a cease-fire and verify the cessation of foreign military aid to all the Cambodian factions.

Perhaps you recall that it was discord on this issue that caused the August Paris international conference on Cambodia to end in deadlock.

2. The formation of an interim ruling body during the transition in Cambodia. The State of Cambodia is also ready to discuss this issue taking into account the proposal put forward by Australia.

Australian Foreign Minister Gareth Evans has proposed conferring the role of controlling and supervising the implementation of agreements and organizing general elections on the United Nations. Phnom Penh is willing to accept this proposal providing the world body does not side with any group. So far, however, the United Nations has adopted a different position. It has made a particular mistake by allowing Cambodia's UN seat to be held by the Cambodian opposing alliance, including the criminal Pol Pot regime. Should this stumbling block be removed, by declaring, at least, the UN seat vacant, Phnom Penh would consent to accept a UN role in the settlement of the Cambodian problem.

What is so good about the Phnom Penh initiative? Primarily, it has started international efforts to settle the conflict in Cambodia. It has also taken into consideration constructive proposals drawn up by other countries, such as Australia and Thailand, as well as the United Nations.

It is worth mentioning the realistic policy of Comrade Hun Sen's government, which is characterized by a goodwill that has yet to be reciprocated by opposing the Cambodian groups. The proposal of the Cambodian government is categorically opposed to a military solution and stresses the vital importance of a political dialogue. In this vein, Phnom Penh has suggested the continuation of talks, including a new round of informal inter-Cambodian meetings in Jakarta with the participation of all countries concerned.

The Soviet Union, in a statement issued by the Soviet Foreign Ministry on 16 December, voiced strong support for the initiative made by the State of Cambodia and termed it a new and important goodwill move.

Near East & South Asia

Moscow Comments on Islamic Fundamentalism

NC1912122189 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Persian to Iran 1500 GMT 18 Dec 89

[Andrey Vasiliyev commentary]

[Excerpts] In Egypt, as in other Islamic countries including Iran, an acceleration of Islamic fundamentalism can be perceived. These fundamentalists operate under the slogan of exporting the Islamic Revolution in the Islamic world. [passage omitted]

Here we wish to refer to only one aspect of this and that is the relations among Islamic governments in the contemporary world. Every country in the Islamic world, which [words indistinct] from the point of view of cultural (?heritage) and the common denominator of religion, preserves its national sovereignty. This applies to Arab countries in the truest sense. The theory of pan-Arabism [preceding word in English] has remained on paper and the Arab nations are firmly within their own historical boundaries. To this we may add that their leaders continue to oppose any efforts to question their legitimacy with the displeasure of [words indistinct].

Such efforts took place recently and frequently and were probably directed by extremist groups who are (?linked) to Iran. Shiite organizations which have been established at the direct guidance of Tehran, are being given financial assistance by Iran, and enjoy immense power. The leaders of these organizations have announced that they plan to set up Islamic republics modeled on Iran. This is not to be done by democratic or legal means but by taking hostages, setting off bombs, or making threats.

The demonstrations and uprisings by religious fundamentalists in Algeria and Tunis are not unprecedented. Terrorist actions organized by Shiite extremists have also taken place in Kuwait and Iraq. [passage omitted]

Afghan Rebel Missiles Target Civilians

PM1912145189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 19 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 5

[Special correspondents V. Sevruk and S. Sevruk dispatch: "Civilian Populatio,n Not Military Installations, Are Targets of Missile Terror Campaign in Afghanistan"]

[Excerpt] Kabul—[Passage omitted] Following the Soviet troop withdrawal from Afghanistan, the missile terror campaign in Kabul alone from 15 February through 10 November killed around 600 people and crippled more than 1,500. Boffins from the U.S. military-industrial complex have painstakingly worked on the creation of unique weapons to wage a mass terror campaign against the urban population. Militarily these weapons are not very effective. It is virtually impossible to hit a tank, artillery position, or rifle trench using such missiles, much less a reinforced position in the mountains. But densely packed adobe dwellings, oriental bazaars, or squares in front of mosques are another matter. The U.S. SAKAR-20 and SAKAR-30 missiles cause hundreds of casualties in such places.

Here are the latest figures: A crowd, mainly teenagers, was hit near Kabul's "Pamir" Movie Theater—30 dead. A group of adobe houses in Kabul's sixth district were hit—13 people were killed, an entire family, young and old, was wiped out, and dozens of people were maimed. And the terrorists remain invulnerable, no Interpol will find them. They set up the missiles 20, 30, or even more kilometers away from the city, set a timer to several hours in advance, and depart. And at the set time there are explosions in the city and the whistle of shrapnel—and people die.

The terrorists recently used a new weapon against the population of Kabul—a U.S. cluster missile. Its warhead contains 98 shells encased in thin high-plasticity metal. The container opens at a certain altitude and the 98 shells are dispensed one after another; upon impact their casing produces tiny shrapnel which literally drills its way into and through the human body. It is virtually impossible to remove. Again this is not a weapon for military confrontation. Such shrapnel would not penetrate even a soldier's helmet, let alone a bulletproof vest. But Kabul's soccer-playing kids are the terrible victims of this state-of-the-art tool of modern urban terrorism.

We met with Afghan officers and military doctors and visited a special guards hospital. There were virtually no officers and men there who had been hit by the cluster bombs. The aim of the missile terror campaign is clear: Since the armed opposition detachments have failed to bring the Army under their control, they have to terrorize the cities and make life hell for hundreds of thousands of people, whereby at any moment you and your family could be killed in the most unexpected place—a schoolyard, by the mosque wall, or in the line at the gas station. Then, they think, the urban population will prefer to capitulate on any terms rather than live for months in expectation of a cruel and inexorable death.

Afghan security and Army intelligence organs told us that cases had been recorded of opposition detachments selling cluster and other missiles far beyond Afghan borders. So, if one fine day some "brigade members" or "avengers" launch a missile terror campaign thousands of miles away from Kabul, one can recall that the jumping-off point for such atrocities were the complacency and indifference of the many politicians, intellectuals, and members of mass movements who today calmly flick through newspaper reports on explosions in Afghan city streets.

The world community has already risen up against international terrorism and is pursuing united action and demonstrating courage and resolve. Thousands of lives have been saved. So, is the world community really unable to halt the missile terror campaign against Afghan cities, and to do so today in order to ensure that tomorrow a similar campaign does not claim victims in other parts of the world? This missile terror campaign should be declared a crime against humanity.

East Europe

Reportage on Situation in Romania

Borders With Soviet Union Closed

AU1912132489 Cologne Deutschlandfunk Network in German 1200 GMT 19 Dec 89

[Gabor Kiszely report from Hungary]

[Excerpts] The situation in the besieged town of Timisoara is largely quiet. In the early morning hours, shots could be heard. However, this does not mean fighting; it is the continuation of the hunt for people, started by the security authorities the day before yesterday [17 December] following the demonstration which was forcibly dispersed by the Army and the security service, Securitate. [passage omitted] The Hungarian Parliament in a resolution yesterday [18 December] protested the events and demanded the implementation of human rights in Romania. In the evening, a mass rally was held in Budapest, and a silent march took place in front of the Romanian Embassy.

Of course, there are still no reactions from Romania. What we have heard, however, is the fact that meanwhile, the Romanian side has also closed the border with the Soviet Union this morning [19 December].

Moscow TV on Situation

LD1912204189 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 19 Dec 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast; read by announcer]

[Text] Sofia—According to a report circulated by the BTA news agency, a tense situation has prevailed for more than 24 hours at the Bulgarian-Romanian border. At 2300 on 17 December, the report says, the Romanian border authorities unilaterally and without prior notice halted crossings from Bulgaria to Romania at the Dunav Bridge border point. The Romanian side also introduced almost the same restrictions for people traveling on international railways. The unilateral measures of the Romanian authorities, BTA stresses, have created an abnormal situation at the Bulgarian-Romanian border point, and the actions of the Romanian border authorities have led to incidents. Romania has practically closed its border with Bulgaria, the reports says.

Belgrade—As reported by the TANJUG NEWS AGENCY, Romania has closed its border with Yugoslavia after a clash between militia and army units with demonstrators in the city of Timisoara, Arad, and some other inhabited points of the Socialist Republic of Romania which began 3 days ago. According to accounts by eyewitnesses returning from Romania, the agency points out, there are dead and wounded as a result of the clashes. In the center of Timisoara, some stores and buses had been burned and store windows smashed. Eyewitnesses assert that several thousand demonstrators shouted slogans demanding civil rights and a change in the country's leadership. The disorders in Timisoara began after the Romanian authorities coercively resettled the senior priest of the local Reformist Church, Laszlo Tokes, from the house he occupied. The priest Tokes is Hungarian by nationality and is known in Romania as a defender of rights who has advanced a number of demands concerning the situation of the Hungarian national minority.

Budapest—At a session of the Hungarian state assembly, a statement has been adopted on the events in Timisoara. The Hungarian Parliament expressed concern in connection with the human rights situation in Romania and called on the Romanian Government to observe the obligations assumed in international accords and in the Constitution of the Socialist Republic of Romania and to remove discriminatory measures with respect to national minorities. In Budapest, MTI reports, there was a many-thousand-strong demonstration by a number of parties and public organizations of Hungary as a sign of solidarity with Tokes and those taking part in the demonstrations in Timisoara. On Monday, traffic through the Hungarian-Romanian border control point of Nadlac was practically halted.

Bucharest—The organ of the Romanian Communist Party Central Committee, the newspaper SCINTEIA today published an editorial article titled "The Laws of the Country To Be Consistently Observed and Firmly Applied." It says, in particular: In our society, no one is permitted to violate the laws and legal decisions without taking responsibility for their actions. Those who resist, or refuse to carry out legal decisions commit grave violations of the law aimed against society and undermining its juridical foundations. This is why the socialist state and our society cannot tolerate such a grave violation of their interests. For this reason, all state bodies with duties in the given sphere should bring to account any individual guilty of violating the law.

Ceausescu 'Calm' Noted

LD1912185589 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1535 GMT 19 Dec 89

[From "The World Today" program presented by Igor Fesunenko]

[Text] One can only envy the self-control and composure of the great leader [velikiy vozhd] of the Romanian people, Nicolae Ceausescu. He has gone on an official 3-day visit to Iran. Here you can see the official seeing-off ceremony at Bucharest Airport, and it truly is a ceremonious event. Anyway, he's gone off on this trip at a time when far from everything is calm at home.

First, for more than 24 hours now there has been a tense situation on the Bulgarian-Romanian border. BTA reports that at 2300 on 17 December the Romanian border guards, the border authorities unilaterally and without advance notification suspended all travel from Bulgaria to Romania via the Dunav Bridge border point. The Romanian side has introduced almost identical restrictions for people traveling on international trains.

For its part, TANJUG reports that Romania has closed its border with Yugoslavia following clashes between the militia and army subunits and demonstrators that began 3 days ago in the towns of Timisoara, Oradea, and other Romanian settlements. According to eyewitnesses returning from Romania, things are generally very unpleasant there. People were killed and injured during the clashes in the center of Timisoara, for example, shops and buses were burned down and shop windows were smashed. The eyewitnesses claim that several thousand demonstrators have shouted slogans demanding civil freedoms, democratization, and a change in Romania's leadership.

The unrest in Timisoara began after the Romanian authorities forcibly evicted the priest of the local Reformed Church, Laszlo Tokes, from his home. Tokes is a Hungarian by nationality, but he is well known in Romania as a human rights activist and he has put forward a number of demands concerning the situation of the Hungarian ethnic minority.

In the meantime, in Hungary itself, the National Assembly adopted a statement on the events in Timisoara. The Hungarian Parliament expressed concern over the human rights situation in Romania, and called on the Romanian Government to fulfill its obligations under international accords and the Socialist Republic of Romania Constitution, and to cease its discrimination against ethnic minorities. On Monday, communication via the Hungarian-Romanian border control point at Nagylak was virtually brought to an end. the line of cars there has reached 1 km in length and the waiting time is over 4 hours.

In Tehran, meanwhile, Nicolae Ceausescu has calmly begun talks with Iranian President 'Ali Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani. So there you are.

Business Trips to Romania Normal

LD1912181489 Moscow TASS in English 1746 GMT 19 Dec 89

[Text] Kishinev December 19 TASS—By TASS correspondent Eduard Zakharov:

Tens of Soviet citizens heading for Romania with groups or as individual tourists have had to interrupt their trips and return home.

Authorities of the Ungeny railway station on the border with Romania told TASS that the would-be travellers were denied entry into Romania.

Business remains as usual at all station services. Cargo transportation between the USSR and Romania has not been disrupted. Romanian tourists are returning home after visiting the USSR. Business trips continue in both directions. Transit passengers bound for Bulgaria encounter no hindrances.

In Moldavia, there is a temporary ban on the free sale of railway tickets for tourist groups and individuals wishing to visit Romania.

Bulgarian Border Situation Reported

LD2012000789 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 19 Dec 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] On Monday [18 December], 60 Polish and 60 Bulgarian tourists were removed from a train and sent back to Bulgarian territory. The actions of the Romanian border authorities led to incidents. Bulgarian television cited comments of Poles who had returned from Romania to Bulgaria that they were treated like prisoners, they were convoyed, and they were not allowed to move at railway stations. The news agency report notes that Romania has practically closed its order with Bulgaria. [Video shows border territory, border point, trucks, guards with dogs, tourists seated, sleeping and being interviewed]

More on Unrest, Border Closings

LD1912235689 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2108 GMT 19 Dec 89

[From "The World Today" program present by Igor Fesunenko]

[Excerpts] Judging from the reports from news agencies, the situation in Romania, in particular in the town of Timisoara, where there was unrest over the last few days accompanied by loss of life and pogroms, still has not returned to normal. The TASS correspondent in Bucharest addressed a request to his colleague in the news agency AGERPRES that he should at last explain what is happening in the country and in Timisoara. Well, he heard the laconic phrase, "we have not heard anything about any events in Timisoara, we have not received any reports from there". We shall not speak ironically about this. We shall be self-critical and recall that quite recently, you and I were witness to such evasive, so to speak, answers when it was a question on some of our complicated problems and some kind of unpleasant happenings in the life of our country.

At the same time, the official Romanian authorities have informed the countries on their borders of the closing of the borders for tourists. [passage omitted]

In the official letter sent to the Intourist representation in Bucharest, it states that due to the unfavorable weather conditions, the lack of snow for winter tourism, as well as the large requirements for hotel rooms for students and other pupils who are there during the holidays, groups of tourists from the USSR will not be received. [passage omitted]

Well, the TASS correspondent has reported that a certain amount of tension is evident at the moment in Bucharest itself. The guarding of state institutions has been markedly increased. Shops and factories are being guarded and patrolled. Party and other activists are in constant attendance on the streets of the city. Not only voluntary law and order squads, as we would say, are on patrol but soldiers armed with machine guns, fighters of the Patriotic People's Front. In some places, there are coaches with servicemen and militia staff in them. In a word, the situation is apparently a complicated one indeed [Video shows border post]

Romanian Media Silent on Unrest

PM1912172389 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 8

[Own correspondent V. Volodin dispatch under the general headline: "Tension in Romania"]

[Text] Bucharest—As already reported in IZVESTIYA (No 353), there were disturbances in the city of Timisoara in western Romania at the weekend. According to unofficial data, several thousand demonstrators shouted slogans demanding civil freedoms and the replacement of the country's present leadership. Troops and militia detachments are patrolling Timisoara's intersections and the entrances to the city. According to reports of a private nature, the army has also placed the neighboring city of Arad under its control.

Romanian official news organs have not yet carried any reports on the events which have been played out. President N. Ceausescu's trip abroad and also the labor successes of Romanian working people feature as the chief topics in television broadcasts and in the pages of the central newspapers.

The newspaper SCINTEIA, organ of the Romanian Communist Party Central Committee, has published an editorial article which states, in particular: "No one in our society is permitted to violate laws and court decisions without answering for his actions.... Therefore all state organs with responsibilities in this sphere must institute proceedings against any person guilty of an offense."

The seriousness of the situation is attested by Romania's virtual closing of its borders with Hungary and Yugoslavia. Only diplomats and specialists on official business may cross the borders. Romania has suspended exchanges of tourist groups with all countries, including the Soviet Union. A telegram received at Intourist states that because of the warm weather, which is unfavorable for winter vacationing in Romania, tourist exchanges with the USSR are suspended through 5 January. All tourist groups from the Soviet Union will be sent back. The situation remains calm in the Romanian capital. City transport is operating normally in Bucharest, and stores are functioning. The only echo of the Timisoara demonstration, in my view, are the reinforced militia details and the Patriotic Guard patrols armed with submachineguns which are appearing in some places.

GDR Extraordinary SED Congress Reported

IZVESTIYA on Congress Decisions

PM1912143189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 11

[Own correspondent V. Lapskiy dispatch under the rubric "Panorama of International Events": "GDR: Extraordinary Congress Ends"]

[Text] Berlin—In the spacious parking lot in front of the "Dynamo" sports complex, where the extraordinary Socialist Unity Party of Germany [SED] Congress was held, I did not see a single gleaming Tatra—the entire space was filled with modest Trabants and Wartburgs bearing the license plates of various regions in the GDR. To be honest, the scene was unusual to someone who has seen many events on this kind of scale before. Democracy is perhaps the main distinguishing feature of this congress. The reasons for the present crisis are being given and analyzed and possible solutions proposed. The situation in the party is more than serious: It has been abandoned by more than 500,000 of its members. By no means all of those who have returned their membership cards are fair-weather friends and careerists. Many have done this because they have learned of the scale of the corruption and abuses of the "Honecker team."

The delegates' speeches have been filled with bitterness at the past and concern and alarm over the present. But I also discerned an optimistic tone: The party is capable of getting back on its feet after the heavy blow and playing an important role in a renewed society. The party is changing its name: Henceforth it will be known as the Party of Democratic Socialism. This was the decision taken at a closed sitting of the congress. The party's new name will be given the final stamp of approval after discussion in primary organizations.

In the opinion of the party chairman, Gregor Gysi, the legal basis of the Party of Democratic Socialism will be defined next year, with the adoption of a law on parties. Those who are still members of the party "accept responsibility for its history and do not intend to evade responsibility for the past." The party has announced its final break with Stalinism and is getting down to the task of complete self-renewal in all earnestness.

The congress distributed a report from the Central Party Control Commission on the former SED leaders' flagrant violations of party and ethical norms and crimes against the party and the country. The report stated that the chairman of the commission, Werner Eberlein, has had a meeting with E. Honecker, who has admitted full responsibility for the situation that has arisen in the country and the party.

The congress delegates were also presented with a report by Professor Michael Schumann, a member of the working commission, entitled "On the Crisis in Society and Its Causes, and on the Responsibility of the Party." This lengthy document examines the history of the SED from its formation and the path it has traveled, full of contradictions and drama. Refusal to accept the perestroyka and glasnost proclaimed in the Soviet Union, the report says, gave a basis to the slogan "Socialism in GDR Colors." Today you would be perfectly justified in calling it "Stalinism in GDR Colors." The working commission has submitted a proposal to "rehabilitate all those who fell victim to Stalinist persecution—whether in the Soviet Union or in our country—and, to this end, to establish contacts with the competent Soviet organs."

The commission has also proposed that the party be separated from the state and that all social forces be given the possibility to express their views in the mass media.

On Sunday G. Gysi delivered a report on urgent party tasks. He said that at present the party has 1.7 million members. This is a sufficiently powerful force, he said, to fight for the future and take part in the election campaign. The party will give its full support to Hans Modrow's coalition government. The country's future will depend to a considerable extent on the government. G. Gysi stressed that in the past decades the republic's citizens have worked hard and lived feeling angry but proud of themselves—through their efforts and their work, they have won the right to self-determination. This cannot now be placed at risk. The people's peaceful democratic movement has opened up a unique opportunity to create a genuine, social, humanist alternative to counterbalance the FRG. We proclaim our commitment to the GDR, G. Gysi said. According to him, the main task of the Party of Democratic Socialism now is to restore vigor to primary party organizations. He appealed to those who have left the party to return. Touching on the subject of the party's organizational structures, he said that henceforth basic work will be conducted on the basis of the territorial principle. But party members must not evade political activity at enterprises.

The extraordinary congress completed its work Sunday.

Renamed SED-PDS Pursues Renewal

PM1912152189 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 19 Dec 89 First Edition p 3

[V. Altukhov dispatch: "Renewal—Slogan of the Day. The Socialist Unity Party of Germany-Party of Democratic Socialism Congress Has Ended in Berlin"]

[Text] Socialist renewal is an objective necessity, G. Gysi, chairman of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany-Party of Democratic Socialism [SED-PDS] said in his speech Sunday [17 December] at the party's extraordinary congress, which has ended in Berlin. The party's new title is to emphasize the democratic and socialist traditions of the GDR Communists and their desire to resolutely put an end to the bureaucratic edict methods of leadership, both in the party and the country as a whole, and to play an active part in the all-around and consistent renewal of all aspects of life in the republic.

The main hero of the society's democratic renewal are the people who have made their voice heard loud and clear during the mass demonstrations and rallies which swept through the Republic in October and November.

The demands of the peaceful demonstration participants reflected the profound dissatisfaction of broad strata of the population with all forms of dictatorship, bureaucratic tutelage, claims to omniscience on the part of one party, and disregard for human dignity and the rights and freedoms of the individual. At the same time they have shown how firmly rooted the idea of socialism is among GDR people, the idea of socialism based on the tangible results of the country's economic and social development in recent years. The achievements of the spontaneous upsurge of the masses, which, it must be noted, were joined from the very beginning by numerous healthy forces of the SED, are impressive and promising. Literally before our very eyes profound qualitative changes in the political superstructure are being worked, a superstructure which was multiparty in form but one-party and authoritarian in essence. The abnormal growth of the SED's leading role expressed itself in particular in a joint decision of the SED Central Committee Politburo and the republic Council of Ministers of 1960, on the basis of which the state apparatus was called upon to implement the party's decisions.

Probably the most unexpected result of the events of the past few weeks in the GDR has been the stunningly swift evolution of the SED from a ruling party in total control to a party which occupies a position on par with the republic's other political forces, albeit a prominent one. This stems from the ardent desire of the party's healthy forces to prevent a social explosion in the country, which has become a realistic possibility, especially after the exposure of instances of corruption and other abuses on the part of the former GDR party and state leadership, and also the healthy forces' desire to stave off the threat of a rapid erosion of the party's ranks.

The content of the congress is determined by the task to put an end, once and for all, to the Stalinist structure of the SED and to lay the foundations for the formation in the GDR of a new, modern socialist party capable of waging a struggle for an alternative democratic socialism in cooperation with all the other forces of good will. In connection with this the party's title has been changed and a new program document and draft party statutes have been adopted.

A sharp critique of the bankrupt, Stalinist, i.e. administrative-centralist socialism in the GDR which has led the country into a political and economic crisis was made in the reports of G. Gysi, the party chairman, and Professor M. Schumann. This type of socialism which prevailed in the GDR and other socialist countries proved incapable of substantially contributing to the solution of mankind's problems and only exacerbated the crisis of civilization.

On the other hand, despite all the achievements of the West German society, the rule of capitalist magnates is just as unacceptable to the GDR as the sway of the politburocrats, G. Gysi stated. Therefore the only way out of administrative-centralist socialism's crisis is not its renewal but a third option which has nothing in common with either Stalinism or the sway of the multinational monopolies.

The current notions concerning this third option of the SED-PDS, which is pursuing radical renewal, comprise service of the working people's social interests and a focus on the basic values of democratic socialism—the rights and freedoms of the individual, joint development of all members of society, equal conditions for the development of everyone's individual capabilities, and the preservation of mankind's natural and cultural heritage. The crux of the reform of the political system is pluralism and the consensus of social forces.

The party has declared its commitment to the traditions of Marx, Engels, and Lenin, and of democratic, communist, social democratic, socialist, and pacifist movements. It views these traditions critically, and consistently addresses the problems arising from changing present and future conditions.

The implementation of the economic reform presupposes the preservation of public ownership of land and other key means of production, and the introduction of diverse forms of practical management of property by the working people.

The SED-PDS assesses the ending of the cold war and the opening of the GDR's western border as a new opportunity to contribute, while preserving the republic's sovereignty, to the solution of the German question—not within a narrow-nationalist framework, as advocated by right-wing conservative and extremist circles in the FRG, but as part of the process of the democratization and demilitarization of Europe and of building the common European home. This trend has numerous supporters among influential forces in the FRG and other West European countries who have criticized the program for the unification of the two German states put forward by West German Chancellor H. Kohl.

The published conceptual ideas of the SED-PDS maintain the party's traditional commitment to the alliance with the CPSU and to the development of all-around friendly relations between the GDR and the Soviet Union on a new, equitable basis. It is emphasized that this alliance is of vital importance for the GDR.

The GDR is the only socialist country in which the flow of the revolution is not disrupted by strikes. National economic plans are being fulfilled on the whole. If, according to the classics, violence is the "midwife of history," then in this case, I believe, it is possible to speak of peaceful, political violence.

Commentary Views Congress

LD1912225889 Moscow TASS in English 2056 GMT 19 Dec 89

["Results of East German Communist Congress—TASS Comments"]

[Text] Moscow December 19 TASS—By TASS political analyst Aleksandr Kondrashov:

The results of the extraordinary congress of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany/Party of Democratic Socialism (SED-PDS) have added the element of stability and predictability to the political development of the German Democratic Republic.

Dramatic developments in recent weeks gave rise to concern for the party's destiny among its friends in the republic and other countries. The legacy left by the previous leadership proved too hard to bear, not only because of its selfishness and abuse of office. It looked as if the spirit of passiveness and dogmatism fostered in the party ranks for a long time would not permit fast re-grouping and the working out within a very brief period of a programme meeting society's interests and aspirations.

It does honour to the party ranks and their delegates to the Congress that they were able to dispel the doubts. The process of renewal was as rapid in the party as in society attesting once again to the close links between the Communists and the entire nation, and their joint aspirations for democratisation.

An analysis of the materials of the extraordinary SUPG-PDS Congress shows that the sharp and well-deserved criticism of the past did not prevent the delegates from advancing constructive proposals and working out a creative programme of the renewal of the party and its entire activity in the political, economic and social fields and in its interrelations with all public forces.

The materials of the Congress form a good basis for boosting the party influence on industrial and agricultural workers, intellectuals and other layers of society in a new pluralized system. They make evident the continuity of the values inherent in the history of the left democratic movement in Germany and, at the same time, the best traditions of the recent decades accumulated in the course of construction of a socialist German state.

I believe that these values and traditions formed the basis for the Congress's expression of allegiance to the independence and sovereignty of the German Democratic Republic and its rejection of plans to let West

Germany swallow its smaller neighbour. The interests of European stability and the international legal aspects of the issue of the two German states are undoubtedly very important, but what I found most essential in the attitude to these problems of the delegates to the Congress was their loyalty to the republic, to the creation and construction of which several generations of its citizens have already contributed their efforts and energy, and their confidence of the possibility to create a human and social alternative to West Germany.

The conclusion of the party congress marked the beginning of responsible work to recover, under new and more complex conditions, the party's leading role in society. The Congress as the party's supreme body accomplished the task of closing ranks and boosting the morale and confidence of the party's rank-and-file members.

It is on their innovative activity, initiative and confidence that the actual authority of the party in society as well as popular support for it in the general elections scheduled for May next year will depend.

Predictions are hard to make. I would only like to note that the Soviet people have been following with sympathy and solidarity the efforts of the fraternal party to democratise and renew society. We all wish the Socialist Unity Party of Germany/Party of Democratic Socialism success in its responsible uphill work.

1953 GDR Uprising To Be Reassessed Soon

AU0612102289 Cologne Deutschlandfunk Network in German 1000 GMT 6 Dec

[Text] According to Colonel General Volkogonov, head of the Military History Institute at the USSR Defense Ministry, the failed uprising in the GDR in 1953 will be reassessed soon.

This morning Volkogonov said on Deutschlandunk Network that playing the ostrich, as he put it, is useless with regard to history. At the same time, however, the colonel general warned against precipitate action. The current discussion about the military activities of the Soviet Union over the past decades must not lead to disturbing the balance in Europe.

GDR Security Body Disbanded; Neo-Nazis Mushroom

PM1912150389 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 19 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 6

[Own correspondent V. Lapskiy dispatch: "Government Decision"]

[Text] The GDR Government has decided to disband the National Security Department. A monitoring commission has been set up in Berlin to oversee the disbandment. The commission includes representatives of the parties and movements taking part in the "roundtable" meeting, as well as representatives from the Prosecutor's Office and the police.

A so-called citizens' committee will be founded at the commission's next session. Its members will be representatives of the police, political parties, social movements, and the church. On the basis of the specific situation, the committee will coordinate the activity to maintain public security. Its activities will be publicized.

It has been announced that the government is planning to set up a GDR intelligence service and a service to protect the Constitution. These will be directly subordinate to the chairman of the Council of Ministers. Their tasks will include maintaining constitutional order in the republic, combating espionage and attempts to undermine the national economy, suppressing extreme right-wing, neofascist, and anti-Semitic demonstrations, and fighting terrorism.

Today's Berlin newspapers reported that, according to F. Schoenhuber, leader of West Germany's Republican Party, tons of Nazi literature are being sent into the GDR. Its recipients are underground neo-Nazi groups in the GDR which, in Schoenhuber's words, have mushroomed of late.

Ryzhkov Welcomes CSSR Premier Calfa on Arrival

LD2012092889 Moscow TASS in English 0820 GMT 20 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 20 TASS—Czechoslovak Prime Minister Marian Calfa arrived in Moscow today on a working visit at the invitation of the Soviet Government.

At the airport he was welcomed by Soviet Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov and other officials.

Soviet Public Figures on CSSR in 1968, 1989

AU0912181589

[Editorial Report] Bratislava PRAVDA in Slovak on 6 December on pages 1 and 6, under the headline "Better Late Than Never..." carries a 1,200-word report on replies by various Soviet public figures to questions from Vladimir Jancura, Bratislava PRAVDA's correspondent in Moscow, about their reaction to the Warsaw Pact representatives' and Soviet Government statements of 4 December on the Soviet-led invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968.

Academician Andrey Sakharov tells Jancura that, although there are some "imprecise formulations" in the Soviet Government statement as well as "an attempt at self-justification," the very fact of the two statements' publication is "very positive" and he feels "great relief." Sakharov also "welcomes the successes of the Czechoslovak democratization movement," saying that "they drive Soviet perestroyka forward and are an example for us."

Political scientist Vyacheslav Dashichev says that this reassessment is a "long-expected act which should have come much sooner" because the suppression of the

Prague Spring also had a "very negative impact on life in the Soviet Union, conserving the Stalinist model of socialism." Dashichev recalls that he had already demanded such a reassessment in an article in MEZHDUNARODNAYA ZHIZN in July. Asked about his view of current developments in Czechoslovakia, Dashichev says that "he is enthusiastic" about the "lightning revolution" in Czechoslovakia and the "humane way in which it is carried out" and adds that "it can only benefit the building of a common European home on renewed, healthy foundations."

The official reassessment of August 1968 and the current events in Czechoslovakia are also welcomed by IZVESTIYA commentator Stanislav Kondrashev.

LITERATURNAYA GAZETA's Oleg Bitov, finally, tells Jancura that the Soviet Government was prepared to issue such a statement in spring of this year but that "as far as I know it was not so much Jakes as Fojtik who categorically opposed the reassessment of the year 1968." Bitov also notes that, had the democratization process in Czechoslovakia not been "brutally suppressed" 21 years ago, it would have been much easier to push through perestroyka in the Soviet Union today.

IZVESTIYA Updates CSSR Developments

PM1912162989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 19 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 5

[Own correspondent L. Kornilov dispatch: "CSSR: Slovak Communists' Forum Ends"]

[Text] Prague—An Extraordinary Communist Party of Slovakia Congress ended late Sunday night [17 December]. More than 800 delegates attended. K. Urbanek, general secretary of the Czechoslovak Communist Party [CPCZ] Central Committee, took part in the congress, as did 27 former party members who had been expelled after 1968. The Slovak Communists decided that the "CPCZ must be turned into a modern European-style left-wing party capable of competing with other political forces."

On 17 December it was a month since the law-enforcement forces' reprisals in Czechoslovakia against the peaceful student demonstration. In Prague tens of thousands of demonstrators retraced the route taken by the students that November evening. The candle-lit procession stopped on Narodni Trida, where the bloodshed took place, and then proceeded to a rally in Wenceslas Square.

The television carried a long broadcast on the events of 17 November. Numerous witnesses and documentary film showed that the law-enforcement forces' actions were by no means aimed at "impeding" the demonstration but at severely beating up the students, who were surrounded and thus could not escape. As one of the members of the parliamentary commission to investigate the law-enforcement forces' actions reported, 143 people needed help from doctors, who recorded injuries, fractured skulls, collar bones, and shoulder blades, concussion, and other ailments.

The presidential election campaign is continuing. Confirming in the Italian newspapers L'UNITA and LA REPUBBLICA his readiness to run for president, A. Dubcek also said that he did not intend to rejoin the CPCZ, from which he had been expelled, and stated that, in his opinion, in the future Czechoslovakia would be better suited by the model offered by the Swedish political system. In a conversation with a CTK correspondent, another candidate—C. Cisar—advocated that the president of the republic be a figure "above party politics."

Speaking on television, V. Havel said that, if society's interests require that he accept the presidency, he would do so. But on two conditions: only for the period needed to prepare for and hold free elections to the Federal Assembly, which would then constitutionally elect a new president. And that Alexander Dubcek should be alongside him in some capacity. Calling him the "most outstanding man that Slovakia has given the country and the world," Havel stressed that he would not allow "any dark forces to drive a wedge between him and me, and thereby between our two peoples."

Wielding huge wire-cutters, Austrian and CSSR Foreign Ministers A. Mock and J. Dienstbier symbolically cut the barbed wire on the border between the two countries Sunday. This border, in the Czechoslovak minister's words, "has only been a border for the past 40 years—for the thousand years before this it did not exist."

Answering questions from representatives of the Slovak public, Dienstbier stressed that the views of the Soviet and Czechoslovak sides vis-a-vis the building of the "all-European home" currently coincide. As for the question of the presence of Soviet troops in the CSSR, its resolution would be promoted by the visit to Moscow this week by Premier M. Calfa and J. Dienstbier, the CSSR foreign minister stated.

Civic Forum Activity at CSSR Plant Described

PM1912152589 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 17 Dec 89 Second Edition p 5

[Special correspondent I. Nekrasov report: "Waiting Line For Schillings"]

[Excerpt] Prague-Kladno—[Passage omitted] Here in Na Prikope on Thursday [14 November] I witnessed a student demonstration. They marched in even rows with banners and placards to Wenceslas Square to express their support for V. Havel—candidate for the post of head of state. This question—the election of a president—will be decided in the Federal Assembly.

Portraits of Havel can be seen literally everywhere: colored ones, black and white ones, large and small. The same could not be said about the other candidates except, perhaps, for Cestmir Cisar, former secretary of the Czechoslovak Communist Party [CPCZ] Central Committee in 1968. But are the strikes, demonstrations, and peculiar pressure tactics not "Civic Forum's" permanent ultimatum to the CPCZ? I wondered. After all, democracy is first and foremost about choice. An ultimatum means the absence of choice. What is the "Forum" proposing? What are its aims and tasks? Isn't its vigorous activity producing a one-sided match?

"Civic Forum" was formed as a movement a few days after the events which took place in Prague on 17 November. Supporting the young students' demands, the "Forum" rapidly began to win supporters. Now many people have the "tricolor"—a red, white, and blue ribbon or badge—pinned to their jacket or coat. The number of placards in shop windows, on the walls of houses, and in the subway is increasing daily.

One thing, it would seem, is inexplicable—"Civic Forum," whose representatives are gaining popularity, does not have either a leadership or even...members. There are only "Forum" supporters—that is, all those who support its program. Its conciseness and accessibility should be admired. In their turn, many people, including many communists, are still dissatisfied with the CPCZ's action program formulated to consolidate the party ranks, and they point to its verbosity and abstractness. Well, possibly this criticism indicates best of all that there is an interest in change and in a rethinking of the party's activity, as well as concern for its future.

"Civic Forum's" supporters are also thinking about their own future, because "Civic Forum" has no structure—the movement has only local units. It would be best to see this work with one's own eyes at local level. So I set off for the bus station.

The city of Kladno is 20 km from the Czechoslovak capital. Of its 70,000 inhabitants around one in three works at one of the country's largest enterprises—"Poldi."

Maybe once a week, for 90 minutes right after work (this is a mandatory condition) in the Poldi Trade Union Committee building, there is a meeting of Civic Forum "mluvci." This word may be translated into Russian as "representing the interests," "speaking," "stating." Around 50 people met that evening. A representative of the CPCZ action committee was also among them (there are 3 to 5 people on these committees, in contrast to 9 to 15 members each on the former traditional party groups). It was mainly workers from various shops who came. The direction of "Forum" activity can be judged by the questions discussed: the CPCZ's pullout from workplaces, new trade unions, the breakup of the people's militia, and the supervision of its weapons depots. The principles of the cadre policy at the enterprise were also put forward.

"Our conversations with the Poldi director have shown," engineer and active "Civic Forum" member Marcela Zajicova told us, "that he is taking 'Civic Forum' into account."

At the same time, the CPCZ primary party organizations at Poldi have disbanded. Those who want to remain members of the Communist Party are switching to organizations where they live. Even the enterprise party committee stopped working about a week ago. Some communists have become "Civic Forum" supporters. Those who are left in the CPCZ ranks have decided to pay the symbolic party dues— one koruna—and give the rest for public health needs in the Kladno district.

Bulgarian Assembly Condemns 14 Dec Incident

PM1912161789 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 19 Dec 89 First Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Bulgaria: Nationwide Support"]

[Text] Mass rallies and demonstrations have of late become a commonplace occurrence in the life of Bulgarian society. As a rule, they are organized by public organizations and independent associations advocating, above all, resolute perestroyka in the political and economic spheres, pluralism, and democracy.

At the same time, recent events during a National Assembly session were a new test of the Bulgarian people's political maturity. On the evening of 14 December the following slogans rang out at a rally in front of the parliament building: "Down with the Bulgarian Communist Party!," "Resign!," and "General Strike!" They were accompanied by hooligan excesses. The organizers of the rally—representatives of a number of independent organizations—pursued quite different objectives according to their leaders; however, they lost control of the situation. Despite their appeals and an address from the parliament deputies, a section of the people gathered in the square took a long time to recover their senses. In a National Assembly statement adopted that same day, these actions are described as an "antisocialist, anticonstitutional demarche." Under the obvious influence of forces who had a stake in this, a demonstration of political barbarism and intolerance was staged in the vicinity of the Bulgarian Parliament building, the statement says.

As early as the next day, the events were unanimously and resolutely condemned by labor collectives and the population.

Categorical disagreement with actions of this kind was also expressed by independent organizations. We join in the general condemnation of such phenomena, says a statement by the "Public Forum for Perestroyka and the Defense of Socialism" organization.

Twenty-four hours were more than enough for the Bulgarian people to assess what had taken place in the square in front of the National Assembly, RABOTNICHESKO DELO writes, generalizing the opinion of the working people and representatives of various sections of the population. There was only one reaction—actions of this kind can only impede the democratization of society and destabilize the situation in the country. Dialogue between the various social forces must form the basis of the democratic processes, the newspaper writes.

Nemeth Resignation From MSZP Presidium Noted

LD2012115489 Moscow TASS in English 1127 GMT 20 Dec 89

[Text] Budapest December 20 TASS—Miklos Nemeth has resigned from the Presidium of the Hungarian Socialist party (HSP) [MSZP]. He announced his decision in a letter addressed to HSP Chairman Rezso Nyers, the MTI news agency said.

Nemeth said his resignation had been prompted by the Presidium's refusal to accept a government programme on housing reform.

MSZMP Congress Decides on Party's Renewal

PM1912104189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 19 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 5

[Own correspondent F. Lukyanov dispatch under the rubric "Panorama of International Events": "MSZMP: Renewal"]

[Text] Budapest—Some 65,000 registered party members were represented by the delegates to the 14th Hungarian Socialist Workers Party (MSZMP) Congress, which decided to continue the party's activity.

As is well known, October's extraordinary congress of the former, 700,000-strong MSZMP resolved by an overwhelming majority to found a new party—the Hungarian Socialist Party (MSZP)—operating on the basis of fundamentally new statutes and policies. The MSZP currently has slightly more than 50,000 registered members. A considerable number of MSZMP members disagreed with the creation of a new party and advocated the continuation and renewal of the MSZMP, under the leadership of its former general secretary K. Grosz, and the holding of the scheduled 14th Party Congress.

What will the renewed MSZMP be like? What are its tasks and its attitudes to the other parties and social organizations operating in the country?

Taking issue with those who try to present the MSZMP as a refuge for Stalinists, K. Grosz stressed in his report that it would be a "left-wing Marxist party" breaking with the mistakes of the former MSZMP, not least as regards the implementation of the 1988 party conference course of extensively democratizing sociopolitical life.

The declaration adopted by the congress condemns the mistakes and illegality of past decades, which led to the loss of the party's prestige and a crisis in the country. The MSZMP, by renewing itself, intends to rid itself in the most resolute manner of abuses of power, all forms of privilege, leadership subjectivism, and corrupt and amoral people. The full restoration of intraparty democracy and its optimal combination with the principles of democratic centralism—which should not evolve into bureaucratic centralism—should be a highly important aspect.

The MSZMP intends to continue to be a party of workers, peasantry, and intelligentsia, relying on the best traditions of the communist and social democratic movement. Finding itself to all intents and purposes in opposition, K. Grosz stated, the MSZMP is prepared to cooperate with all the country's political forces—above all, leftist forces—which are trying to get the country out of the crisis.

Recognizing the equality of all forms of ownership in the economy, including private ownership, the MSZMP believes that the way out of the crisis should be sought not on the path of capitalism but through the most effective forms of the functioning of social ownership, with such ownership prevailing in the economy—even though in principle the party does not reject limited privatization.

Judging by everything, one of the most important avenues of MSZMP activity in the near future will be the elaboration of a new cadre policy aimed at extensively attracting young people, since—as was noted at the congress—the party is predominantly made up of elderly people at present (43% of congress delegates were pensioners). The elections of the new party leadership, comprising many young people, were a resolute step in this direction. The 36-year-old Gyula Thurmer has been elected MSZMP chairman. A graduate of the Institute of International Relations in Moscow, he had worked at the Hungarian Foreign Ministry, and last year was K. Grosz' foreign policy assistant. Former MSZMP leaders K. Grosz and J. Berecz became members of the Central Committee.

G. Thurmer told press representatives that before the year's end the MSZMP would have to work out an election program to be examined at the next congress session in early 1990.

PZPR Protests Worsening Law, Order Situation

PM1912142789 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 16 Dec 89 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Poland. Extremism Condemned"]

[Text] Warsaw, 15 Dec—J. Bisztyga, Polish United Workers Party [PZPR] Central Committee press spokesman, expressed serious concern about the worsening security and law and order situation in Poland. There is a rising wave of criminal offenses in the country, while effective actions by responsible state organs to expose crimes are decreasing. Citizens' sense of security has been weakened, and their lives are becoming unbearable because of health- and life-endangering crimes and thefts and burglaries. Speculation has reached enormous proportions. A new wave of revolts in prisons and isolation blocks has led to loss of life, a large number of injuries, and many billions of zlotys worth of material damage.

The street disorders have outraged public opinion, the statement notes. The wave of aggressive actions committed by extremist groups is growing. Public buildings are being torched and public property destroyed. The guardians of law and order are being beaten and humiliated by people who are going unpunished. Monuments are being vandalized. These actions, which are attempts to undermine the law by acting from a position of strength and by contempt for the basic principles of political culture, are damaging the Poles' dignity and honor, adversely affecting relations with neighboring countries, and lowering Poland's prestige in the international arena.

In the face of such a situation, which affects the vital interests of the whole of society, effective measures by the government and cooperation between all forces interested in respect for the law are necessary. The PZPR expects real and effective action in accordance with the constitutional duty to guarantee the protection of law and order, state interests, and citizens' rights, the statement points out.

A protest was made by the committee bureau against an attack on the Krakow PZPR Committee building by a group of extremists on 13 December, the 8th anniversary of the introduction of martial law. As has already been reported, on that day several hundred young hooligans broke into the PZPR Committee building in Krakow, smashed it up, broke windows, and set fire to a newstand. It is estimated that damage amounting to 64 million zlotys was incurred.

We appeal to all party members as well as the forces that really support democracy and pluralism to condemn this act of violence, the statement says. It is necessary to take every measure to prevent the Polish path to democracy from becoming the road to anarchy, the document stresses.

A group of Krakow Sejm deputies and Citizens' Parliamentary Club senators condemned the extremists' 13 December provocative actions in Krakow. Demonstrations by members of the "Wolnosc i Pokoj" organization and the young people who joined them developed into acts of aggression and destruction, the statement says. The forces of law and order, on the pretext of the absence of instructions, remained completely passive for a prolonged period and did not put a stop to insulting actions outside the USSR consulate general, for example. We resolutely protest against the methods of force and vandalism which threaten Poland's good name throughout the world, and its citizens' and visitors' right to security and respect. We believe that the people responsible for the city's security must publicly explain all the circumstances and the course of events, the statement instructs.

SFRY's Markovic Cited on Economy, Reform

PM2012153589 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 20 Dec 89 First Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Government Program"]

[Text] Belgrade, 19 Dec—It will be impossible to get out of the crisis, improve the economy on a firm basis, and subsequently develop it dynamically without creating an entirely new economic and political system to ensure efficiency and political democracy in the SFRY. This was stated by A. Markovic, president of the SFRY Federal Executive Council, in a speech at a joint session of the two chambers of the SFRY Federal Assembly.

The head of the cabinet stressed that the government intends to continue to struggle to switch the country to market relations, to develop all forms of ownership and competition between them, and to eliminate administrative regulation of the economy. Taking account of the "heavy burden of inherited foreign debt," the deepening imbalances in the economy, the technological backwardness of the national economy, the continuing price growth and inflation, and the exacerbation of interethnic relations, it will be impossible to overcome the crisis in a short period and without certain casualties. This will all take 4-5 years.

Moreover, it is planned to introduce a convertible dinar, one of which will be equivalent to 10,000 dinars—the Yugoslav currency. This government step essentially means that it is planned to implement monetary reform in 1990.

Soviet Scholar Views Changes in East Europe

SK1812044089 Moscow International Service in Korean 0900 GMT 15 Dec 89

[Text] Political tensions have reached an extreme point this fall in Eastern Europe. Long pent-up discontent exploded first in Democratic Germany and Czechoslovakia and later in Bulgaria. Our station reporter asked Mikhail (Yassikov), professor of philosophy, for his views on these events.

Answering the reporter's question as to whether or not he considered the mass demonstrations in Democratic Germany, Czechoslovakia, and Bulgaria to be unexpected events, Mikhail (Yassikov) provided the following response:

[Begin recording] [(Yassikov), in Korean] No, they were not unexpected events. Discontent over the orders that have existed in these countries has long been pent up. Is not the crisis that seized Czechoslovakia in 1968 proof of this? In my opinion, the speed and scope of changes were unexpected, but this is quite a different matter.

[Unidentified reporter] Do you suggest that we take the protest demonstrations in the socialist countries to mean that socialist ideology has lost its dignity in the face of the people? I know some commentators in the West are talking about this very point.

[(Yassikov)] It is not the ideology that has lost its dignity, but the various models of socialism that have been established in these countries, which has many nicknames, such as the Stalinist model of socialism, national socialism, and barrack-type socialism; they have lost their dignity. The disease at the core of these superficially peaceful models has begun to emerge and is having a destructive impact on these societies.

[Unidentifed reporter] What prospects do you envision for socialism?

[(Yassikov)] I do not think that these countries will abandon this ideology which has been enriched by the experience acquired in the course of studying 20th Century socialism in which mankind has experienced successes and failures.

Even in the 21st century, mankind will build its future by taking into consideration what socialism has created and has stood for. This system can be reformed and become sort of a humanized system. Socialist ideology still enjoys support in the East European countries. History does not bar anyone from learning. Of course, we should learn from the errors of our own making.

[Unidentified reporter] However, coalition governments have come into power in some East European countries, such as Poland, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia. Now, nowhere else do the communist party members take the leading role in governments. What kind of impact will this have on the cooperative body among the socialist countries?

[(Yassikov)] I think this will weaken the ideological basis that has been assumed to be of great significance in strengthening the cooperative body of the socialist countries. This basis, however, is not the only one. I think that national interests take precedence over ideological interests and that they will have positive impact on strengthening the core trends.

National ties, more so than partisan ties, will probably take on the nature of self-reliance. The visit to the Soviet Union by Polands' Prime Minister Mazowiecki proves this point.

[Unidentifed reporter] Some in the West recently have said that there is a possibility of the so-called Finlandizing of the East European countries. What is your opinion, professor?

[(Yassikov)] In my opinion, this amounts to an attempt to turn a prophesy into reality. In Finland, private capital occupies a leading role in the economy. At the same time, not only does Finland stay out of a bloc, but it also maintains good relations with the Soviet Union. Prophets are trying to put the situation in East Europe on such an orbit. But I do not think that the East European countries have reconsidered their socialist choice. [end recording]

West Europe

Shevardnadze's Visit to Brussels Reported

Meets NATO's Woerner; Cold War Said Over

LD1912125289 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1157 GMT 19 Dec 89

[Text] Brussels, 19 Dec (TASS)—A meeting has been held between E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister, and M. Woerner, secretary general of the North Atlantic Alliance, at NATO headquarters in the Belgian capital. This is the first contact of its kind and it is a graphic confirmation of the end of the "cold war" and the onset of a new era in world politics.

During their meeting, E.A. Shevardnadze and M. Woerner examined basic problems of East-West relations and opportunities for resolving them with the help of developing dialogue and cooperation.

E.A. Shevardnadze also had a meeting with the permanent representatives at NATO of the 16 member countries of this organization. During a conversation there was discussion of problems of setting up political dialogue between the Warsaw Pact and NATO. Questions of reducing conventional armed forces, banning chemical weapons, and certain other international problems were also touched upon.

Says Talks With Woerner 'Useful'

LD1912181389 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1535 GMT 19 Dec 89

[From "The World Today" program presented by Igor Fesunenko]

[Text] USSR Minister of Foreign Affairs Shevardnadze today ends his visit to Belgium, during which an agreement has been concluded on trade, commercial, and economic cooperation between the USSR and the European Community. He will then head for Great Britain for a meeting late this evening with Foreign Minister Douglas Hurd and Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher. But that will be late this evening.

For the moment he is in Brussels and has visited NATO headquarters, where he met NATO's Secretary General Manfred Woerner and the permanent representatives of the member-countries of that military-political bloc. After the meeting the Soviet minister made a short statement for the journalists gathered there.

[Begin Shevardnadze recording] As the journalists have been saying, this has been an unprecedented meeting. The Secretary General will probably agree with me when I say that it was a very necessary, good, and useful conversation. As for what issues we discussed, this is something you are probably going to ask me: many issues, including the real prospects for cutting arms and armed forces. We agree that there is a good chance of completing the talks, the Vienna talks, next year and of signing an agreement. We also believe that it is realistically possible to complete the work on an agreement on a 50 percent cut in strategic offensive arms. The Secretary General shares this view. The talks on concluding a chemical—a convention banning chemical arms look very promising to us. [end recording]

Comment on Romanian Events

AU1912135789 Paris AFP in English 1229 GMT 19 Dec 89

[Excerpt] Brussels, Dec 19 (AFP)—The European Economic Community (EEC) on Tuesday expressed outrage at Romania's crackdown on protests and warned of unspecified retaliation against the regime of Nicolae Ceausescu.

Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze, meanwhile, said he had only had "some very preliminary information" about the incidents in Romania, where according to Western and Hungarian media reports, quoting eyewitnesses, hundreds of protestors have been killed. "I can only say that if indeed there was some loss of life I can only express my profound regret," he said after his visit to North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) headquarters. [passage omitted]

[London PRESS ASSOCIATION in English at 1436 GMT on 19 Dec adds the following: "...Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze said after talks in Brussels with the president of the European Parliament that it was a very sad situation but it was for Romanians to sort out their own destiny."]

Addresses Europarliament on German Issue

PM2012123889 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Dec 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS dispatch from Brussels: "Europe: A Time of Change. E.A. Shevardnadze's Speech at the European Parliament Political Commission."]

[Text] E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister, addressed the Political Commission of the European Parliament today. He said:

Esteemed Mr Chairman, ladies and gentlemen: I see my meeting with you today as a sign of the times. It shows how much has become possible today. However, all of us must now be prepared for what will become possible tomorrow.

But just what may become possible tomorrow? In the given situation the role of prophet is undoubtedly a thankless one. Therefore, it is better to concentrate on signs of the times. Through them, like through a crystal ball, it is also possible to discern the outlines of a reality that was previously unthinkable.

We arrived in Brussels during the work of the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies. The screens of our televisions reflect the uncommon rapidity with which such democratic categories as pluralism of opinions and freedom to express them are taking root.

As Jean Monnet put it, "We cannot stand still when the whole world has started moving." However, in observing the current movement, it would be unfair to keep silent about the force which gave rise to it. In our country we call this force perestroyka, the process of democratization and renewal that was brought to life by the objective requirements of our development.

This complex and intricate process has shown others that new times are really beginning and that no one is even thinking of attempts to make new streams follow old channels. If you are engaged in perestroyka in your own house and in organizing it on fundamentally new principles, then how can you hinder the same sort of work in other countries?

The only thing that should concern you is the very possibility of losing the formative criteria through this process, the possibility of chaos and confusion and a phase which is vitally important for our continent and for the world.

Only given this condition is it right to assert that the movement upon which our world has embarked is movement in the right direction. Only, I would not advise haste in making statements about the end of history and of socialism.

Let us make a distinction between a specific model of socialism operating in one country or another and the idea of socialism as a component of the single process of civilization.

In the countries of Eastern Europe, as in the Soviet Union, a natural breaking-up of the administrative-command system of organizing life and a transition to democratic forms of managing society are now occurring, which are, incidentally, typical of other states as well.

The intense search for a path is typical for many today. Many today would like to know precisely which roads lead to the temple and, indeed, what kind of temple is required.

We think we are close to an answer. However, while we are in solidarity with the leaders and peoples of the allied states, we have no intention of giving them directions of any kind. Moscow does not want to, and will not, be the custodian of bygone standards of "proper behavior", against which the other socialist countries must measure their actions. Our call to take the ideology out of interstate relations is not aimed exclusively at the West. Naturally, in professing common values with our friends, we remain loyal to them without, however, making the ideological aspect absolute in practical politics.

It is, no doubt, difficult to reproach us for lack of boldness or political courage. We have told the harsh truth about ourselves. We have told the truth about Afghanistan and about much more. And we have waited for our friends to be prepared to do the same. In places where they have preferred to remain silent, it is the peoples who have spoken.

One would like to believe that Czechoslovakia has recently realized how we regard the events of 1968. The very logic of restructuring has formed our attitude to these and other events and to the forces that are applying the brakes in some countries of Eastern Europe.

Everyone has now been able to satisfy himself that the present changes in those countries are taking place in conditions of complete freedom of choice for those peoples in choosing their own path and their own methods of building a new society. Our respect for that choice is respect for the complete sovereignty—unrestricted by ideology—of the countries of Eastern Europe, respect for their desire for independence, which does not exclude possible transformations of social, economic, and political institutions.

It is characteristic that all these countries have confirmed their obligations as allies under the Warsaw Pact. In our opinion, this is an important prerequisite for preserving stability in present conditions. It stands to reason that the times require amendments to the system of mutual relations within our alliance. Modernization of its structure will only be to the advantage of our joint interests. In our opinion, its very character, in which political features prevail over military content, should change.

This work is already being carried out. It has become particularly active after the Bucharest session of the Political Consultative Committee and is now close to conclusion. In this connection, we welcome the recent remarks by U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker on NATO's first new task, in which the military component must be weakened and the political component strengthened.

This is not a momentary problem. Other aspects of it can be settled only on a multilateral basis within the framework of agreements between the military-political alliances and within the framework of the Helsinki process.

The recent storm on Malta has brought a brighter period. M.S. Gorbachev and U.S. President George Bush, during their Meditterranean meeting, agreed to assist in accelerating the talks on limiting conventional forces on the territory from the Atlantic to the Urals. Both sides consider that completing their task in 1990 is fully practicable.

This, however, does not mean that we are putting our own affairs off until some better time. From the point of view of politics, better times are, so to speak, "opportune times." This is why the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia will begin consulations in the near future on our troops in that country, taking into consideration the common European process of disarmament.

But all this is matter. We should talk about consciousness as well, remembering the discussions in the West, stirred up by events in the East, on what is fundamental—spirit or matter, an idea or the material reasons for its appearance.

As is not difficult to guess, I will talk about the socialist idea.

The recently published article by M.S. Gorbachev "The Socialist Idea and Revolutionary Perestroyka" is a deeply theoretical interpretation of this concept in light of contemporary realities.

I won't repeat myself. I will just say that the socialist idea as an accumulator of all mankind's thirst for equality and justice is a permanent, constituent part of civilization.

In such a capacity it encompassed the age-old dreams of mankind about a dignified existence for man in a society free from violence, arbitrary rule, and enrichment of some at the expense of the robbery and impoverishment of others, from the beginning and for forever. There is probably no such period in the history of mankind when such dreams in one form or the other did not manifest themselves. Historians, including Western historians, convincingly testify that as early as the 21st century BC in the land of the Sumerians attempts were made to realize this ideal. The same had taken place in Ptolemy's Egypt, in ancient Rome, in China BC and AD, and in the Incas' state.

The command-administrative system has distorted the socialist idea. We shall not dwell on the reasons for this, the objective ones as well as the subjective.

But we shall say that it is not for the sake of the deformed concepts, but in the name of the great ideas that the millions of people went through sacrifices and deprivations. However, as the matters develop in these or other societies in the future, we are convinced that the socialist type of guidelines shall continue, as in the past, to be the guiding ones for these societies.

There are streams and floods of human thought which cannot be stopped either by time or by prosecutions for "heresy". Remembering well where I am, I would like to refer to the time of the Reformation.

Personally, without arguing the other objectives of perestroyka, I see in it a Reformation of the socialist idea and practice, which, I am sure, will declare itself as a true expression of justice, equality, and freedom.

It may be that it is too bold an assumption, but in the interdependent and integral world the categories whereby it is seen either from one or the other viewpoint will gradually disappear.

It is not my intention to ennoble captialism. I will not take it upon myself to assert that it is now charitable toward man and that it does not engender deep social ills. It is, however, beyond doubt that in the most developed countries capitalism has undergone a process of evolution and it is now far from what Dickens or Upton Sinclar described to us. It was compelled to take account of the struggle of the working masses and, not being stupid, did accede to some of their demands. Let us be just and say that as far as some ideas are concerned, it gleaned a lot from socialism and it is largely thanks to this that it survived.

Now, while socialism is undergoing a process of evolution, it is legitimate for us to dream and speak of the future as being a time when on the basis of universal human values there will come into being a synthesis of the best and loftiest achievements of social and political thought worldwide.

Moreover, let everyone remain, whoever they perceive themselves to be. Let no one convert anyone to what he believes, endeavoring to replace export of the revolution with the export of "Western values."

We remain ourselves. The sacrifices, deprivations, errors, and losses have not been forgotten. Claas' ashes [pepel Klaasa] continue to touch the heart to the quick. They are still hot and they burn one's chest. But it is precisely knowledge of the past, coupled with the vision of the future, that prompts one to search for a single axis that unites systems, an axis with social, spiritual, and material coordinates.

As applied to Europe, these proposals, hopes, and searching are to be found within a perfectly specific and practical question: Should Europe remain a zone of polarization of forces, or can it become a polycentric community of peoples and states?

I think that what is happening at present on the continent, what is happening here now, clearly indicates the second option.

Europe is wonderful and strong in its diversity, diversity of styles, cultures, and philosophies. Besides, in the synthesis of ancient, Gothic, renaissance, baroque, neoclassical, and modern there is nothing like its unique make-up and spirituality. The organic fusion of different elements is not imitative eclecticism but a deep requirement of the essence.

Thus our movement toward each other is also stimulated by the same phenomenon.

The agreement between the Soviet Union and the European Communities strengthens the belief of all Europeans in the possibility of a united Europe and gives a new quality to the cause of mutual rapprochement between East and West.

The processes of integration reflect an objective need—not only a management, economic, and spiritual need, but also a political need, touching on the area of security. We somehow lose sight of the fact that Europe, which has been divided into blocs and military alliances, is politically the most integrated region of the world. All European states are members of the all-European Conference on Security and Cooperation, within the framework of which all problems and all issues are resolved by general agreement.

Each of our countries has taken upon itself certain obligations and made its own behavior subject to generally recognized norms and standards.

Today one can already speak of the existence of the elements of a single European law-governed expanse. We are all bound by the Helsinki Final Act, by the Vienna agreement, and by other treaties.

Many aspects of European life are determined by documents in international law relating to the postwar settlement; by the continuing responsibility of the four great powers; by the activity of the allied military liaison missions in the two German states; and also by the treaties concluded by the FRG and the GDR with their neighbors.

The legal invironment in Europe is so saturated that any state is obliged to take existing provisions into account in its actions. Otherwise, it is possible to accidentally catch some point of detail or other and by pulling it upon oneself bring about the collapse of the whole structure.

Specifically, I have in mind the situation surrounding the GDR. The Soviet Union's position in this regard has been expressed in the speech by M.S. Gorbachev at the plenum of the CPSU Central Committee on 9 December of this year.

We stress with complete resolve that we will stand up for the GDR, he said. It is our strategic ally and a member of the Warsaw Pact. It is essential to proceed from the realities that have come into being afer the war—the existence of two sovereign German states that are members of the United Nations. Departure from this threatens destabilization in Europe.

I would also like to put forward another proposition: We are in favor of further peaceful cooperation between the GDR and FRG on principles of respect for the equality and sovereignty of both German states. As for the future, this will be determined in the course of history within the framework of development of the all-European process.

This is a clear, unambiguous, and exhaustive stance. Within the boundaries of its framework, I would like to reflect aloud a little. Current events are taking place in conditions of the actual existence of two German states, recognized by the whole world, and acknowledging themselves as such.

They are taking place in circumstances in which these two states belong not only to different but to opposing military and political alliances.

In the future, the necessity for the existence of these two alliances will pass, but the road to that goal will not be easy. It presupposes profound alteration of the relations between NATO and the Warsaw Pact and a change in the very nature of these organizations.

It is not fortuitous that the treaty on the basis of relations between the GDR and FRG, which was concluded in 1972 and is of unlimited duration, also provides for only the gradual development of relations between both sovereign German states in an upward direction: from existence side-by-side with one another to existence together with one another and for the working out of closer forms of interstate cooperation between the GDR and FRG in accordance with the development of the all-European process.

It seems to me that this is a sober view and that such a prospect would meet the interests of all European peoples and the Germans themselves to the greatest extent. The idea of gradualness, of weighing things, and of a responsible approach to the questions that are arising and intensification of the links between the GDR and the FRG, is present in the statements of the leaders of both German states.

This must be welcomed. The basis of the development of the Helsinki process should not be called into question nor should it go to ruin on German soil. That is impermissible. The allied states bear responsibility under the Four Power Agreements and the decisions of the war and postwar period, and they have at their disposal a considerable contingent of armed forces equipped with nuclear weapons on the territory of the GDR and FRG.

It is not possible to ignore the judicial and legal realities without jeopardizing the present order of things, which for 40 years now has been guaranteeing peace and calm and the constructive development of interstate relations in Europe. No one has an interest in turning back the historic process of development.

One of the main components of the German question, of the whole European situation, is acknowledgment of the fact of the definitive and irreversible decision regarding the borders of Europe. He who would want to cast doubt upon this is blocking off tightly all possibilities for serious advancement in the development of relations between the GDR and the FRG.

Of course, each German state retains the right to self-determination. But it can be used only in the context of other norms and principles of international law, taking account of the particularities of the situation of the two German states and their responsibility before the peoples of the whole of Europe and the world that never again should the threat of war emanate from German soil.

Moreover, the very concept of "self-determination" implies the exclusion of any external pressure upon the state. For this reason, any appeals or advice to practice "self-determination" and instructions on how and at what times to change the state structure of the GDR are not only inappropriate, but may also place in doubt the purity of this possible allegedly free choice.

I should recall using historical information that right until the point at which the FRG joined NATO, the Soviet Union was in favor of a united, democratic, and demilitarized Germany and adhered to the point of view that the unification of the two German states was possible in certain circumstances and in the appropriate political-historical context, given an indispensable and clearly expressed readiness for this on the part of the two German states.

Circumstances changed after the FRG's refusal to take part in the holding of free elections throughout Germany in 1952 and the FRG's joining the system of closed Western military-political and economic blocs. Since then new realities have come about which have grown organically into the new postwar European structures.

Recently, the question of the self-determination of the German states has become the subject of sharp discussions. Calls for the GDR to join the FRG give rise to anxiety not only among the political parties and population of the GDR, for they are being invited to renounce their own statehood and make the GDR a part of NATO.

The neighbors of the GDR and the FRG are also worried. One can understand them also. Can one realistically raise the question of various particular forms of restoring German unity or that of practical approaches towards its solution without being clear on many vitally important points?

First, where are the political, juridical, and material guarantees that German unity, in the long term, will not create a threat to the national security of other states and to peace in Europe? There is no answer to this question.

Second, will such a hypothetical Germany—if it comes into being—be willing to recognize the existing borders in Europe and renounce any territorial claims whatsoever? As is known, the Government of the FRG is avoiding an answer to that question.

Third, what place would this German national formation take in the military-political structures existing on our continent? For one cannot seriously think that the status of the GDR will change radically while the status of the FRG will remain as it was.

Fourth, in the event of German unity taking shape, what will the real potential of this new formation be? What will its military doctrine and the structure of its Armed Forces be? Will it be prepared to take steps toward demilitarization, to adopt a neutral status and radically restructure its economic and other ties with Eastern Europe as was envisaged in the past?

Fifth, what will be the attitude toward the presence on German soil of allied troops and the continued operation of military liaision missions and the Quadripartite Agreement of 1971?

Sixth, how will the possible creation of such a German formation tie in with the Helsinki process? Will this promote its constructive development in the direction of overcoming the division of Europe, eliminating any discrimination in mutual relations between European states, and further movement toward creating unified legal, economic, ecological, cultural, and information zones in Europe?

Seventh, if the German states do in some way express themselves in favor of starting to move toward the unity of the Germans, will they be ready to consider the interests of other European states and, on a collective basis, to seek mutually acceptable solutions for all issues and problems that may arise in this connection, including concluding a European peace settlement?

The list of these questions could be continued. Of course, they are not asked in vain. It is a matter of the fundamental conditions for the existence and development of the people of Europe. In any case, the people of the Soviet Union have the right to know what changes in the center of Europe may mean for their future and their security. We paid for the current stability in Europe with the lives of 20 million of our people.

Surely the German people cannot forget the national tragedy to which Hitlerism doomed them.

As one of the allied powers, the USSR cannot relieve itself of the responsibility for the possible consequences of specific developments in Europe. But we do not wish to stand in the way of the legitimate interests of Germans, a great people that is our close neighbor in Europe.

We wish only good for the two German states. Alliance and friendship link us with the GDR. We cooperate with the FRG in many fields and our relations are developed. Their basis is the system of treaty obligations, the apex of which is the historic statement, signed in the summer of this year by M.S. Gorbachev and H. Kohl, the federal chancellor.

As a permanent member of the Security Council, the Soviet Union will be guided by the resolve, expressed in the UN Charter, to "save the future generations from the calamaties of war which twice in our lives brought unimaginable horrors to mankind."

This is precisely a case when legitimate interests of peoples should not be set off against legitimate interests of other peoples, and when a solution can be found not through unilateral actions and precipitate steps, but through mutual agreement of all interested sides.

Any right has, inherent to it, a duty to take into account the rights of other people, other nations. Rights go hand-in-hand with obligations and responsibility—otherwise they are not rights, but the notorious Faustrecht, the right of might.

We share President F. Mitterrand's view that not a single European country can act without taking into account the European balance and without taking into account the interests of others, or without taking into account the current historical situation that has taken shape as a result of World War II.

If our political farsightedness [politicheskaya optika] is not letting us down, then it is legitimate for us to draw the conclusion that signs of political extremism have appeared in Europe. It casts aside political realities and the historical memory of hundreds of millions. It wants to arrive at some kind of a model, ignoring the old wisdom that you cannot sew material in one place in such a way that it should tear in many other places.

It is criminal to fail to take into account the fact that in modern Europe, full of arms to overflowing, including nuclear arms, it is very easy to destabilize the situation, provoke epidemics of hatred and enmity, and throw the continent back to the Time of Troubles.

History itself prescribes heightened circumspection for Europe, where, on more than one occasion in the past, the national idea has been overshadowed by military banners and where the consequences of this are still making themselves felt to this day. That same history reminds one that the national idea, directed towards a noble cause, has served progress, peace, and the general benefit of the European people.

Today the process of European development is by itself extremely complex: on the one hand, the gravitation towards integration under the multistarred flag of a single Europe, "Project 1992", to which the Soviet Union wishes all kinds of successes, and on the other, the dangerous irrationalism of destruction of the postwar realities to the detriment of the common interests.

No matter how one assesses what is happening now in the western and eastern parts of Europe, one cannot help seeing that it is going through one of the most crucial periods in its history. The "cold war" has ended. That is not contended at a serious level. A peaceful period of European development is beginning, but this is a complex and stormy period. It is not guaranteed a straight and even road. Various things may happen. Who will guarantee the exclusion of the danger of emergence of a dictatorship, of the transformation to totalitarianism, or of the beginning of crisis situations on a European and even worldwide scale.

It is namely because of this that it is necessary to cherish what has been achieved, to safeguard the common European harmony, and to strengthen mutual understanding and cooperation.

To lead Europe across the risk zone taking shape ahead is a matter for the present generation of politicians. We cannot fail in this.

Only the deepening of the common European process and the decisive dismantling of the structure of military confrontation with the parallel planning and erection of a common European home and of integrating structures in various spheres will further the formation of a really united Europe.

It is necessary today to double efforts and force the pace of talks on the reduction of all types of armaments—in Europe and beyond its borders—and on strengthening and expanding confidence-building measures.

It is necessary to create an element of countermovement in the area of nuclear weapons. We favor their complete elimination, while the reply is talk of minimum resources of deterrence. Well, we agree. Let's begin talks on this basis, and then go over to the next stage.

Now that the very situation in Europe is stimulating political thinking and that the most diverse projects and proposals have come crashing down upon the continent as from a cornucopia, some of them have already acquired the character and form of agreements. I am referring to the statement of the session of the European Council that took place in Strasbourg at the level of heads of states and governments and its decisions on instituting a bank of European development and a fund for cadres' training.

The foreign policy calendar has become more tightly compressed. A state of what I would have called positive concern is bringing the best political minds of Europe and the world together. Among the present numerous contacts, the dialogue in Italy and the Vatican, in Malta and Kiev, is revealing a whole series of typical characteristics of the contemporary situation in the world and in Europe.

In the first place, that is the convincing confirmation of the creative role of the common European process, the realization that it should outstrip the course of political evolution and impart to it dynamics and guidelines. It is namely with this significance and in light of the events taking place in Europe that we regard the proposal made by us on carrying out in the coming year a common European summit.

Taking account of the shortage of time, particularly acute in light of the extremely rapidly developing events, the participants in a European "summit" [sammit] could combine the signing of agreements on conventional armaments and confidence-building measures with the discussion of the possible ways of further overcoming military confrontation in Europe, and also examine and elaborate an agreed approach to the present state of affairs on the continent.

I think that during this meeting the talks should take place on the permanent structures of working parties, the absence of which slows down development of this process. The time gap of 3 years between the main all-European meetings of the Vienna type is a period too long for the present pace of developments in Europe. The fact that the main job on elaborating the new ideas and suggestions brought forward in the framework of the CSCE is carried out on the national level does not meet the requirements of our times. We are convinced that there is an urgent need to coordinate these ideas in the specialized multilateral agencies—committees or centers of the CSCE that utilize groups of highly qualified experts. These agencies could later adopt advisory functions, and maybe even a supranational character, if an agreement of all the 35 CSCE countries to this is forthcoming.

The realization of such projects as the center for reduction of the danger of war and prevention of a sudden attack, the center for urgent ecological help, the European institute of human rights, and others could provide the first landmarks on the way to creating the all-European committee of the ministers of foreign affairs of the participant CSCE countries, to found a tradition of yearly meetings of the heads of state on a systematic basis and a forum for the permanent all-European contacts made up of representatives from all the 35 countries.

A discussion on military doctrines is to be held in Vienna. Maybe it would be worthwhile to hold it with the participation of chiefs of general staffs? The question of practical cooperation between NATO and the Warsaw Pact is on the agenda. One should hardly wait for their internal evolution to be complete before tackling this question.

Several months ago the Warsaw Pact countries proposed that relations of political dialogue be established between both alliances, along with contacts between their representatives. We note with satisfaction the growing interest of NATO countries in this proposal. This morning I met and talked with Mr Woerner, NATO secretary general, and with the ambassadors of the alliance's member countries. I think the press is not exaggerating in calling this meeting unprecedented. I would add that it has been very interesting and promising.

In this context, I cannot but mention the December session of the NATO Council and the communique it adopted. This document requires an attentive and scrupulous study and we are dealing with it. However, one can already at this stage note: If one casts the ritual propaganda elements aside, this is a serious document, in the spirit of the new times, a document that is quite unlike its predecessors.

All this also belongs among the features of the times which only yesterday seemed impossible. However, as I have already said, it is more interesting to think and speak of what may become possible tomorrow.

For example, our most active cooperation with the European institutions of integration: with the European communities, which are becoming a more and more noticeable and dynamic factor in international politics; with "The Twelve", our dialogue with whom will be 1 year old in just a month's time, though it has already managed to pick up a great deal of speed and establish itself as a very promising channel of contacts between

East and West; and with the Council of Europe, where we have begun joint work to define a range of conventions, which have every chance of acquiring a genuinely all-European character and of becoming the first practical contribution towards shaping a European legal space.

Perhaps with regard to West Berlin we shall be guided by the principle that everything that is not forbidden is permitted?

You and we have every reason for optimism. There is every reason to assert that, for all the contradiction of the events that are going on, we are by no means experiencing the decline of Europe. No one desires that, especially not the Europeans themselves. On the contrary, our common desire and common goal is a political revival on the continent, which manifests itself principally in the surmounting of its division.

This means the surmounting of its division on the basis of values which the European peoples, including the people of Eastern Europe as well, will choose freely and without prompting from outside. They must not be viewed as a mirror which reflects, in the words of some of our Western colleagues, the "eternal strength of the best Western values". Propaganda and rhetoric are not the best instruments for laying a road which should, contrary to Kipling, enable East and West to meet.

Perhaps it is the first time that such a possibility has been arising in postwar history. It is promoted by the Soviet-American dialogue, which is evolving from confrontation to mutual understanding, and in the long-term to interaction. The clear pronouncement by M.S. Gorbachev to the effect that the Soviet Union is ready to regard the United States of America not as an enemy, and that in no event will it start a war agasint it, stood out all the more against the bad Mediterranean weather.

I think that in this auditorium there is no need to enlarge upon the significance of this thesis, which is essentially opening a new chapter in world politics.

This historic sentence is not merely about us not starting a war. The main thing in it is that we are ready to start peace. Strictly speaking, we have begun it already, and now our main task is to give it the scope to develop on the continent, and subsequently, everywhere on the planet. Already now we are obliged, all together, to overcome the notions of confrontation and enemies, replacing them with the categories of cooperation, mutual understanding, and interaction.

And may the creative genius of Europe, which on more than one occasion has defended its truth in victorious encounters with the demons of evil and violence, help us in this.

I thank you for the opportunity to address you.

Meets EC Leader, Foreign Ministers

PM2012124089 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Dec 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS dispatch from Brussels: "Meetings, Talks, Exchange of Opinions"]

[Text] Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze had a conversation with President of the Commission of the European Communities Jacques Delors.

They highly appraised the agreement on trade and commercial and economic cooperation between the Soviet Union and the Economic Community concluded in Brussels.

The agreement is an important step to the creation of a single economic zone in Europe.

Many-faceted intensive work for the implementation of its potential is ahead.

Discussing prospects for the further development of economic cooperation in Europe with the participation of the Economic Community, Shevardnadze emphasised the importance of using the mechanism of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA). This organisation of East European countries has problems and its activity requires modernisation, but it would be a mistake to ignore it.

Both sides expressed the consensus that the preservation of stability, the making of transformations in the atmosphere of peace and tranquility is the most important condition for overcoming the present difficulties, for economic prosperity of entire Europe.

Shevardnadze had a meeting with foreign ministers of the economic community. Taking part in the meeting were the following foreign ministers: Roland Dumas of France, Gerard Collins of Ireland, Gianni de Michelis of Italy, Jacques Poos of Luxembourg, Hans van den Broek of the Netherlands, Joao de Deus Pinheiro of Portugal, Douglas Hurd of Great Britain, Marc Eyskens of Belgium, Uffe Ellemman-Jensen of Denmark, Hans-Dietrich Genscher of the FRG, Francisco Fernandez-Ordonez of Spain, as well as Deputy Foreign Minister Ioannis Pottakis of Greece. President of the Commission of the European Communities Jacques Delors took part in the meeting.

There was a free exchange of opinions on a broad range of most important problems of world politics and the economy. It was noted that the removal of artificial barriers dividing nations creates unique conditions for bringing European civilisation to a new level of development.

It was emphasised that with all the varieties of levels and forms of political and diplomatic contacts, meetings between the foreign minister of the Soviet Union and foreign ministers of member-countries of the European Community offer an additional valuable opportunity for the development of a political dialogue between the

Soviet Union and the European Community and for the establishment of constructive cooperation between them in every area of their relations.

Shevardnadze had a meeting with West German Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher. Extending the debates they recently held in Moscow, they exchanged opinions on specific features of the current European policy, about the role that the Soviet Union and West Germany are called upon to play in the present situation and serious responsibility they have.

Shevardnadze had a conversation with Italian Foreign Minister Gianni de Michelis. It was emphasised that Mikhail Gorbachev's recent visit to Italy opened a new stage in versatile Soviet-Italian cooperation. Some specific steps for continued broad dialogue between the two countries were outlined.

At the NATO headquarters in Brussels Shevardnadze met with Secretary-General of the North Atlantic Alliance Manfred Woerner. This first contact of this kind is the sign of times and the patent confirmation of the fact that the cold war is over and that a new era in world politics has set in.

Shevardnadze and Woerner discussed fundamental problems of East- West relations from the viewpoint of the possibilities of their constructive solution through a dialogue and cooperation.

Shevardnadze met with President of the European Parliament Enrique Baron Crespo. They discussed questions connected with consolidation of stability and security in Europe and the further deepening of the Helsinki process.

The sides noted that in conditions of democratisation the role of parliamentary ways in the construction of a common European home has enhanced and the entire complex of relations between Eastern and Western Europe improved.

Shevardnadze flew from Brussels to London today.

E.A. Shevardnadze had a meeting with the permament NATO representatives of the 16 countries belonging to that organization. In the course of a lively conversation the ambassadors inquired about the concrete content of the idea of establishing political dialogue between the Warsaw Pact and NATO and the proposal for an all-European meeting at the highest level in 1990. E.A. Shevardnadze supplied the necessary clarifications on this score. Questions of the reduction of conventional armed forces, the banning of chemical weapons, and certain other international problems were also touched on.

Interviewed at Brussels Airport

LD1012225989 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 19 Dec 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast; interview with Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze by correspondent K. Mazheyka in Brussels on 19 December—recorded; first four paragraphs are introduction]

[Text] Comrade Shevardnadze ended his visit to Belgium today.

[Mazheyka] A significant event. The solemn signing ceremony of an agreement between the USSR and the EC. Calculated for a 10-year period, the agreement envisages the gradual to complete removal of quotas for EC imports from the USSR, security cooperation at nuclear enterprises, and the development of scientific, technical, and commercial contacts. Contacts, meetings, and talks. The program for the USSR minister of foreign affairs' stay in Belgium was packed full. [video shows signing ceremony] Political figures familiar to you. Roland Dumas—He received his Soviet colleague in his capacity as chairman of the EC Council; FRG Minister of Foreign Affairs Genscher [not seen in video]; Chairman of the Europarliament Baron Crespo.

There, too, Eduard Amvrosiyevich spoke at an expanded meeting attended by members of the leading commissions and party groups of the Europarliament.

Today Comrade Shevardnadze had yet another meeting, in NATO headquarters. A conversation in the working office of the secretary general of the North Atlantic Alliance—an occurrence unprecedented in diplomatic practice, but a fact, nonetheless. In general, commentary is superfluous, especially when we have the opportunity to hear the view of the very person involved in the past events, indeed the most important person. [video shows Shevardnadze standing opposite Mazheyka outside at airport with aircraft behind him]

[Mazheyka] Eduard Amvrosiyevich, for a long time, to put it mildly, the Soviet Union has not included countries such as Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg in the sphere of grand policy. The Western press regards your visit as implementing a new course with regard to small states. Do you agree with this?

[Shevardnadze] In principle, yes. I feel that we must have intensive relations, intensive contacts with all states—with major, medium-sized, and small states, because the construction of a new Europe is a common task of all peoples, both the numerous and the not numerous. And as far as Belgium is concerned, I would say that this is a country with particular political and economic weight—a highly developed country.

[Mazheyka] While at NATO you told journalists that this department reminds you of a sleeping volcano. What, in your view, do both sides have to do to forever exclude the possibility of its eruption.

[Shevardnadze] What is needed is constant dialogue, constant intercourse. And it is necessary to move away from confrontation—in any case we have to strive for this—toward cooperation. I think that such a step has been taken today.

[Mazheyka] Thank you and have a good flight.

Shevardnadze Meets Thatcher in London

European Issues Discussed

LD1912215689 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2054 GMT 19 Dec 89

[Text] London, 19 December (TASS)—E.A Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR minister of foreign affairs, arrived in London on a short working visit today at the invitation of British Prime Minister M. Thatcher. The Soviet guest was met at the airport by T. Sainsbury, parliamentary undersecretary of state for foreign and commonwealth affairs, and L.M. Zamyatin, Soviet Ambassador to Great Britain.

Talks took place between E.A. Shevardnadze and M. Thatcher at 10 Downing street, in the afternoon. The Soviet minister conveyed to the prime minister good wishes from M.S. Gorbachev and set out on a broad political plane the Soviet leadership's assessments of the situation in the world and, in particular, the dynamic processes developing in Europe.

The great importance of the Soviet-American summit meeting in Malta and its beneficial influence on the development of relations between East and West were noted in the context of the general political dialogue. Both sides expressed understanding of the fact that, influenced by the meeting, real opportunities have appeared for reaching major accords to reduce arms and strengthen trust and security in Europe, and in the world as a whole, as early as next year.

An exchange of views on the range of problems in European politics showed up a constructive community of approaches by the sides to their solution and to the prospects for the pan-European process. The British prime minister supported the conclusion that at the present time a responsible policy is a policy aimed at maintaining stability in Europe, recognizing the right of peoples to their own choice, and respecting the legitimate interests of all sides.

Taking into account E.A. Shevardnadze's talks in Brussels and the signing there of an agreement on trade, commercial, and economic cooperation between the USSR and the EEC, the sides noted that this step opens up new broad possibilities for the formation of a common European economic area. The importance was stressed of the effective use of all available channels and forms of cooperation with the help of which a single Europe—a true, common, European home—could be achieved. E.A. Shevardnadze noted the dynamic and profound character of the Soviet-British dialogue, which is an important component part of world politics. The fact that the Soviet Union and Great Britain, along with the United States and France, also bear particular responsibility for peace and stability in Europe by virtue of the four-power decisions of the war and postwar period also lies at the basis of this.

The conversation passed in an atmosphere of mutual understanding typical of the Soviet-British dialogue.

The same day, E.A. Shevardnadze had talks with British Foreign Secretary D. Hurd, in the course of which a number of topical problems and questions of bilateral relations between Great Britain and the USSR were discussed. Soviet Ambassador to Great Britain L.M. Zamyatin took part in the talks.

When the talks ended E.A. Shevardnadze left London this evening for Moscow.

German Reunification Discussed

LD1912213989 London PRESS ASSOCIATION in English 1941 GMT 19 Dec 89

[By Tom McMullan, PRESS ASSOCIATION diplomatic corespondent]

[Text] Mrs Thatcher said tonight that the changes now taking place in Estern Europe should do so against a background of stability and security. This had been provided by the NATO and Warsaw Pact structure, and the Helsinki human rights agreements signed by 34 countries.

The prime minister was speaking on the doorstep of Downing Street after two hours of talks with Soviet Foreign Minister Mr Eduard Shevardnadze, who flew into London from Brussels for talks at No. 10, and also with Foreign Secretary Mr Douglas Hurd.

Mr Shevardnadze, in reply, said the talks in London had been "important and necessary." He said "I must say that on a number of important world issues we have a very good measure of agreement."

According to officials, Mr Shevardnadze, who has been travelling considerably over the last few days, was unable to offer any insight into the crisis in Romania.

Both Mrs Thatcher and her Soviet guest confined themselves to generalities, and would give no details of the subjects discussed. Neither mentioned the prospect of unification in Germany, which was thought to be a major part of the discussion.

Mrs Thatcher said it was important the changes in Eastern Europe should take place against the certain background provided by the alliances and the Helsinki Final Act. This seemed to be a clear signal that Britain wants to see any changes undertaken on a careful, step-by-step basis.

Mrs Thatcher said: "The most important thing of all is that we get democracy into each of these East European counties, accompanied by economic reform. It is important that that takes place against a stable, secure background, which we have now come to know."

Mrs Thatcher also renewed British support for the perestroyka reform programme in the Soviet Union. She said the Soviets were tackling their problems with a will. She added: "Naturally, the foreign secretary and I said once again how very much we are behind, and supporting, Mr Gorbachev in everything he is doing.

"We also made the point that the events happening in Eastern Europe would not have happened without Mr Gorbachev's courage."

Mrs Thatcher said the changes that had taken place in the Soviet Union, in the field of increasing freedom and human rights, and throughout Eastern Europe during Mr Gorbachev's leadership, had been "quite remarkable." She said: "Our task now is to keep the peace, a very constructive peace, to increase prosperity among our nations, and among our people, and to work for a new friendship between East and West. We are now at the beginning of that process."

Mr Shevardnadze said they had discussed a broad range of issues about the situation in the world, and in various regions, including some regions where there were still conflicts. He added: "I attach great importance to the fact that we have agreed to continue our talks on a more regular and systematic basis. Consultations between leading officials of the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom are necessary, given the current situation in the world and in Europe."

Mr Shevardnadze said both sides noted with satisfaction that their bilateral relations had developed dynamically. He looked forward to the visit by Mrs Thatcher to Kiev, and mentioned that Mr Hurd will visit the Soviet Union in April.

Earlier, Mr Shevardnadze and Mr Hurd had what were described as "warm" talks at the Foreign Office. Mr Hurd handed him a list of human rights cases, which he asked him to consider, and he noted that the Soviets were now introducing legislation on human rights.

A visit is expected early next year by the Soviet Prime Minister Mr Ryzhkov to London.

Shevardnadze Returns to Moscow From W. Europe

LD2012142289 Moscow TASS in English 1411 GMT 20 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 20 TASS—Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze, who had paid visits to Belgium and Britain, returned from London to Moscow today.

Ambassador to FRG Discusses German Question

AU1812182889 Hamburg BILD AM SONNTAG in German 17 Dec 89 p 2

[Interview with Yuliy Aleksandrovich Kvitsinskiy, Soviet ambassador to Bonn and member of the CPSU Central Committee, by Helmut Boeger: "Where Is the Gorbachev of the West?"; date, place of interview not given]

[Text] BILD AM SONNTAG: You recently participated in the CPSU Central Committee session, where Gorbachev told his critics: "If you do not like it, I can go." Will he go?

Kvitsinskiy: No one in the Central Committee wants Gorbachev to go. This remark was rather intended to say: "Behave yourself! Not with me!"

BILD AM SONNTAG: A surprisingly high number of people's deputies have come out in favor of abolishing Article Six of the Soviet constitution, which determines the leading role of the CPSU. Will this happen?

Kvitsinskiy: In our country the issues are stability and governability. One cannot now pick a few raisins out of the cake and change individual articles. The changes in the Constitution depend on the people's will. Perhaps Article Six, too, will look different in 1 or 2 years. But we cannot change the Constitution every month. A new Constitution must be valid for generations. Therefore, it has to be discussed and perfected in its entirety at a later date.

BILD AM SONNTAG: Will a planned economy remain?

Kvitsinskiy: An intact economy, whose backbone is made up of the state enterprises, presupposes a plan. One must not let the economy get out of control—this would be a disaster.

BILD AM SONNTAG: In view of the immense economic difficulties, there is the question of whether the process linked with Gorbachev is irreversible?

Kvitsinskiy: The process of perestroyka and glasnost is becoming more irreversible day by day. One cannot make this process nonexistent anymore, even if sometimes there is a step backwards. Even the proverbial Echternach series of jumps, in which two steps are taken forward and one backward, is a forward movement, progress. However, I have not yet seen a step backward in our country.

BILD AM SONNTAG: Does your country continue to advocate the peoples' right to self-determination?

Kvitsinskiy: Yes, we are for the right to the self-determination of the peoples and the states.

BILD AM SONNTAG: In this case, the Soviet Union would accept a nation state consisting of the GDR and the FRG if a freely elected GDR Government strives for it?

Kvitsinskiy: It is the right of the GDR's people to elect a new parliament and a new government and it is the right of this government to pursue a policy toward the FRG, which leads to new treaties, to a new community of treaties. However, no government rules in a vacuum. There is still NATO and the Warsaw Pact, the four-power responsibility, and the CSCE Process. A German solo action would exacerbate the international situation.

BILD AM SONNTAG: Can you imagine the feelings of the Germans in the GDR and the FRG?

Kvitsinskiy: I am not a German. But I respect the feelings of the people who danced on the Wall. However, one must not make it too easy for oneself. We cannot accept a sell-out, an Anschluss of the GDR to the FRG and to NATO. The Soviet Union does not let the GDR in the lurch. If one thinks that the GDR could tolerate being joined with the FRG, why does one not first think of a solution on a smaller scale....

BILD AM SONNTAG: Which one, for instance?

Kvitsinskiy: Think of Berlin. The monstrosity of West Berlin brought about the other monstrosity, that is, the Berlin Wall, in 1961. If the GDR is now undergoing a democratic restructuring, if the Wall no longer works, if new elections take place in the GDR, what reason for its existence will West Berlin then have? It would only be logical if West Berlin were again joined with Berlin. But the reaction of your politicians is completely negative. They say: We remain what we are and how we are. And West Berlin is much smaller than the GDR. Nevertheless, one is afraid of the problems that would develop in such a case. How can one then talk about reunification?

BILD AM SONNTAG: Is the Soviet Union afraid of a new, united German nation state?

Kvitsinskiy: The trauma of World War II remains, but there is also the awareness that we know how to defend ourselves in case of an emergency. Every German soldier knows that it was the Soviet Union that destroyed the German Reich. We are not afraid. But it is nonsense to talk about war under the current conditions. War has become impossible. But we have an emotional, friendly relationship with the GDR. It is our strategic ally and an important economic partner. We have invested much—in every respect—in the development and consolidation of this country. We are against destabilization.

BILD AM SONNTAG: Will there still be NATO, the Warsaw Pact, and two German states in the year 2000?

Kvitsinskiy: The imagination of history is great. It would be a big mistake to assume that all developments are predictable. Maybe there will be two German states in the next century; other constellations are also conceivable. The two pact systems are also not a purpose per se of history, but only instruments of politics, which can dissolve for the benefit of better solutions. I hope that Europe will find its old importance. The world is facing a fundamental change, and within 10 years we might find our current problems ridiculous. Think of the problems of the environment, the North-South conflict, the epidemics, and other things. One needs a great politician to master these problems—otherwise mankind will not survive. Gorbachev is such a great politician. The West also owes a Gorbachev to mankind! The problems of mankind can be solved only together. And here Europe can assume a pioneering role by showing the other states paths into a new future of mankind.

Foreign Ministry Official Receives FRG Envoy

PM1912104389 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 19 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Reception of Ambassador"]

[Text] A.G. Kovalev, USSR first deputy foreign minister, received K. Blech, FRG ambassador to the USSR, 18 December at his request.

Latin America & Caribbean

Reportage, Reaction to U.S.-Panama Clash

Moscow Reports U.S. 'Aggression'

LD2012070989 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0630 GMT 20 Dec 89

[Text] I begin this news bulletin with a piece of news which can have extreme consequences.

Judging from a report from Panama by Bertha Thayer, a correspondent of CNN, a U.S. Television company, the U.S. aggression against that state has started there.

I must remind you that in the past few days, the situation there, in Panama, has been explosive and that Panamanian servicemen, as well as subunits of the Pentagon bases billeted in the Canal Zone, were put in a state of extraordinary military preparedness.

At a news conference during the past day, Panamanian Minister of Foreign Affairs Leonardo Kam placed the responsibility for the present situation in Panama entirely on the Administration of the United States of America. It is precisely the anti-Panamanian policy of aggression, blackmail, constant provocations, and duping of public opinion in the United States of America pursued by the U.S. Administration in the course of 2 and ½ years, that would have to result sooner or later in a flare-up of violence, the minister stated.

TASS Cites Fitzwater

LD2012091189 Moscow TASS in English 0846 GMT 20 Dec 89

[Text] Washington December 20 TASS—United States President George Bush ordered U.S. forces to "execute preplanned missions in Panama to protect American lives, restore the democratic process and apprehend

General Manual Noriega," White House press secretary Marlin Fitzwater announced here today.

Fitzwater said Noriega blocked democracy in Panama and pursued a policy which threatened the safety of U.S. lives in the country.

Forces "adequate to the task" had been dispatched, Fitzwater told a news briefing called in the White House at around 02.00 local time.

He said the operation would be stopped when the designated tasks are achieved.

President George Bush and Vice-President Dan Quayle had contacted Latin American and Organisation of American States leaders, he said.

Congressional leaders were also kept informed about U.S. military action in Panama, Fitzwater said.

Panamanian opposition leader Guillermo Endara, who claimed victory in the annulled May 7 elections, declared himself Panama's president in a speech over radio.

The government's national radio station said Endara's statement was broadcast by an underground radio station, most likely situated at a U.S. base in the Panama Canal Zone.

Fitzwater said the United States recognised the new Panamanian leadership headed by President Endara, which he said had been sworn in. Endara was said to approve the U.S. action.

The White House spokesman refused to answer questions about the whereabouts of General Noriega, saying this could endanger the mission's success.

'Serious Concern' in USSR

LD2012091489 Moscow TASS in English 0911 GMT 20 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 20 TASS—A Foreign Ministry spokesman told TASS that a dispatch about the invasion of U.S. troops into sovereign Panama, no matter what reasons are cited, has provoked a feeling of serious concern in the Soviet Union.

These actions, a violation of the U.N. Charter and generally recognised rules of state relations, should be condemned by the international community. The United States must immediately stop its armed intervention in Panama.

U.S. Military Action Described

LD2012111389 Moscow TASS in English 1025 GMT 20 Dec 89

[Text] Panama December 20 TASS—By TASS correspondent Eldar Abdullayev:

In an address broadcast by Panama's Channel Two state television, seized by U.S. troops, the U.S. Defence Ministry urged Panamanians to remain calm after its troops attacked the headquarters of the Panamanian Defence Force in an effort to capture General Manuel Noriega.

It warned Panamanians against armed resistance to U.S. soldiers or military actions against U.S. facilities in Panama, saying such actions would be punished in accordance with military laws.

The ministry also called on Panamanians to cooperate with the legal governent of Guillermo Endara, who is fighting Noriega's dictatorship.

Speaking over local radio, Endara, who declared himself president of Panama, called on the country's national defence forces to lay down arms and end senseless resistance.

The U.S. operation involves all of Panama, Panama City and Colon, Endara said.

The government's national radio station called on Panamanians to take up arms and repel the U.S. invasion.

The whereabouts of General Manuel Noriega, president and his government are unknown.

Streets in Panama are deserted and there is some movement only near the army barracks in central Panama City, near the presidential palace, the Foreign Ministry headquarters and the National Assembly building.

U.S. paratroopers are massed near the barracks. Fires are reported in some residential areas.

Supreme Soviet Committee on Attack

LD2012165189 Moscow TASS in English 1639 GMT 20 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 20 TASS—The USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for International Affairs regards the U.S. military invasion of Panama as a gross violation of the U.N. Charter and international law, Aleksandr Dzasokhov, acting chairman of the parliamentary committee, told TASS today.

"No motives can justify armed actions on the territory of a sovereign state," he said.

"These actions, taking place at a time when new political thinking is being established in the world, run counter to emerging favourable trends in international affairs and growing confidence among nations," Dzaskohov pointed out.

Solidarity Committee Denounces Attack

LD2012110789 Moscow TASS in English 1027 GMT 20 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow, December 20 TASS—The Soviet Committee of Solidarity with Latin American Peoples has denounced the U.S. armed intervention in Panama, in a statement distributed here today.

The attack flouts the elementary international legal norms, irrespective of the motives the White House is guided by, the document stresses. Washington is acting like a world policeman and decides on its own whom it should punish and whom it should show mercy to, it says.

The law of the jungle and gunboat diplomacy are particularly intolerable now that the world is moving from confrontation to dialogue, the statement says,

The U.S. aggression against one of the world's tiniest states, part of its territory being occupied by American troops, deserves universal condemnation. The aggressor must be made answerable to the world community of nations for its unlawful actions, the statement says.

TASS Interviews President Rodriguez

LD2012133389 Moscow TASS in English 1329 GMT 20 Dec 89

[Text] Panama City December 20 TASS—By TASS Correspondent Eldar Abdullayev:

United States troops which attacked the central barracks of the Panamanian National Defence Force and other facilities in Panama City on Tuesday night, could not capture any members of the Panamanian Cabinet or Armed Forces Command, said Panamanian President Francisco Rodriguez, the overthrow of whom the United States had already reported.

He was interviewed by TASS as Panamanian troops continued to repulse U.S. units.

Apart from 12,000 U.S. servicemen stationed in the Panama Canal Zone, this major U.S. military operation involves the 82nd U.S. Airborne Division from Fort Bragg Base, North Carolina, which participated in the invasion of Grenada in 1983.

The White House statement, made within hours of the start of combat operations, stressed that one of the aims was to apprehend PDF Commander-In-Chief General Noriega.

Heavy artillery fire in the Panamanian capital started last night. U.S. planes and helicopter gunships, from the military bases in the Panama Canal Zone, bombed separate areas of the city. The PDF central barracks are ablaze. A small airport , Paitilla, in the centre of the city has been leveled. The Omar Torrijos International Airport is under control of Panamanian troops. The number of U.S. tanks and armoured personnel carriers in the streets of the old part of the city is growing.

TASS was told at the Santo Tomas Hospital that dozens of killed and wounded, mainly civilians, had been rushed there during the first hours of battle.

The U.S. Administration of the Panama Canal Company today closed the waterway to shipping, for the first time in its 75 year history.

In an address to the people, the government and the chief command of Panama's National Defence Council stressed that despite U.S. criminal armed aggression against their country, which has led to military and civilian fatalities—including women and children—and caused heavy destrution in the capital, the country's military and civilian leadership control the situation over the entire national territory.

The National Defence Council, Dignidad (Dignity) Battalions and People's Militia units succeeded in curbing the offensive conducted by troops of the U.S. South Command.

The Panamanian leadership demanded an emergency meeting of the U.N. Security Council to enable the international community to intervene and stop further bloodshed.

The address calls on all Panamanians, irrespective of their political views to consolidate a united front of resistance and uphold their national sovereignty and freedom.

TASS Interviews Foreign Minister Kam

LD2012155789 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1501 GMT 20 Dec 89

[Text] Panama, 20 Dec (TASS)—Panamanian Foreign Minister Leonardo Kam has called on all international organizations, governments and peoples to demonstrate solidarity with Panama in this difficult hour for the Republic and to demand the immediate cessation of aggression from the Bush Administration.

In an interview with TASS Correspondent Eldar Abdullayev, the minister announced in the name of the country's government and people:

"We want to inform world public opinion of the criminal aggression against a sovereign state which is being carried out with the use of modern means and methods of warfare: aerial bombardments, paratroop drops, and the combing of streets and apartments. According to the data of the Panamanian Foreign Ministry, in the course of armed clashes, already more than 100 people have been killed and several hundred wounded. The vast majority of victims are civilian inhabitants. In this way, Washington is carrying out a most flagrant infringement of the territorial integrity and sovereignty of Panama, the provisions of the Torrijos-Carter Treaty, and UN and OAS statutes."

In the words of L. Kam, SNO [expansion unknown] subunits and all the republic's patriots have demonstrated heroism in defending the country against aggression. The republic urgently needs moral support and material aid. Hospitals are overfilled with dead and wounded; there is not enough donated blood, medicines, or equipment. At the same time, President Bush is hypocritically announcing the Pentagon's intention "to defend the lives of U.S. citizens in Panama," the Panamanian foreign minister stated. "What talk of justice can there be if the provision of the security of one people is realized by the bloodshed, sufferings, and casualties of another," Leonardo Kam said.

U.S. Military Notes Casualties

LD2012141989 Moscow TASS in English 1415 GMT 20 Dec 89

[Text] Washington December 20 TASS—Nine U.S. soldiers were killed and 39 wounded as U.S. troops continue combat operations against the Panamanian national defence forces, chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff General Colin Powell told a special briefing at the Pentagon today.

Powell confirmed that the Americans failed to seize General Noriega. However, the Panamanian leadership has been "beheaded", he said.

TASS Reports Bush Address

LD2012144389 Moscow TASS in English 1434 GMT 20 Dec 89

[Text] Washington December 20 TASS—U.S. President George Bush today made a televised address to the nation on the U.S. military action in Panama. He explained the reasons for his ordering of a major military action against the Panamanian Government, headed by Commander-in-chief of the National Defence Forces General Manuel Noriega.

"Last night I ordered U.S. military forces to Panama. No president takes such action lightly," Bush said.

The President noted that "The goals of the United States have been to safeguard the lives of Americans, to defend democracy in Panama, to combat drug trafficking, and to protect the integrity of the Panama Canal treaty."

Bush called Noriega a "dictator" and claimed that he "publicly threatened the lives of Americans in Panama."

"As President, I have no higher obligation than to safeguard the lives of American citizens. And that is why I directed our Armed Forces to protect the lives of American citizens in Panama, and to bring General Noriega to justice in the United States," said Bush.

"At this moment, U.S. forces, including troops deployed from the United States last night, are engaged in action in Panama," he added. Admitting that there are casualties among U.S. troops, Bush expressed his condolences to their families.

Bush said that "key military objectives have been achieved. Most organised resistance has been eliminated."

A Pentagon spokesman said that the current military action in Panama is the biggest in recent times. According to reports from U.S. TV companies, at least 50 civilians have died in continuing combat operations.

SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA on 'Invasion'

PM2012161489 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 21 Dec 89 First Edition p 3

[A. Bogomolov commentary under general heading: "U.S. Troops Invade Panama"]

[Text] So, what had long seemed inevitable has happened: The United States has begun a large-scale invasion of Panama. The latest news agency reports from the country's capital speak of fierce clashes in the region of Paitilla Airport and the headquarters of Panama's national defense forces. Thus REUTER reports: "Bright flashes from exploding artillery shells can be seen over the Gulf of Panama, and gunfire can be heard constantly. But the main clashes are taking place in the region of Noriega's residence, around which several blocks are engulfed by flames. Dense clouds of black smoke shroud the city."

Eyewitnesses state that the invasion began soon after midnight. Before that, an airlift was in operation for many hours between the Fort Bragg base (North Carolina) and the Panama Canal Zone, which is controlled by the U.S. Administration and where some 12,000 U.S. soldiers are concentrated. According to NBC, giant C-141 military transport planes were landing every 10 minutes. That is how the soldiers and officers of the 82d U.S. Paratroops Division, "famed" for the invasion of Grenada in October 1983, arrived in Panama.

A few events directly preceding the invasion: On Saturday night there was an armed incident when a group of Americans from the Canal Zone shelled the Panama forces' headquarters. According to the U.S. version, the Panamanians attacked an unarmed officer and killed him. On Monday there was another incident, when several shots were fired from a vehicle carrying U.S. servicemen at a Panamanian policeman in the suburban district of Curundu. The policeman was injured.

On Tuesday U.S. President G. Bush had a conference with his leading foreign policy advisers on "the use of armed force in the struggle against drugs." Taking part in the conference were Secretary of State J. Baker, Defense Secretary R. Cheney, Vice President D. Quayle, National Security Adviser B. Scowcroft, and Joint Chiefs of Staff Chairman General C. Powell. A few hours later, the airlift to Panama began.

Immediately after the start of the aggression, a new Panamanian Government was formed, headed by former presidential candidate Guillermo Endara. M. Fitzwater stated that the United States has recognized this government, with which it intends "to cooperate for the sake of creating a free and prosperous Panama." He said that the U.S. troops' objective is to capture Panamanian leader Manuel Noriega and deliver him to the United States for trial in connection with drug smuggling charges against him.

It is quite obvious that now, in the immediate aftermath, the drugs thesis will be the main smokescreen to cover this adventure. It is indeed necessary to combat the drug mafia. Washington has yet to put forward convincing evidence of Noriega's guilt, but it has not hesitated to punish the entire Panamanian people with aggression. Noriega is also charged with the fact that as long ago as Friday the Panamanian National Assembly declared a state of war with the United States.

But it must not be forgotten that the country's parliament was brought to what was perhaps an ill-conceived decision as a result of a whole series of hostile actions by the United States, which has not stopped trying to overthrow the Panama regime and replace it with a more amenable one since February 1988. Thus in October of this year it supported an attempted military rebellion.

A detailed analysis of what happened still lies ahead, but the question arises: Why did the United States take such a dangerous and adventurist step now, when the idea of the peaceful resolution of disputes is gaining ground in the world and when international tension has lessened considerably? The crux of the matter is that the United States, having become accustomed to regarding the country south of the Rio Grande as its own "backyard," could not calmly observe the actions of the Panamanian leadership, which set a course of regaining the Panama Canal.

Commentary Sees U.S. 'Brazen Act'

LD2012131189 Moscow World Service in English 1210 GMT 20 Dec 89

[Excerpt] [Announcer] We start off with the events in Panama last night where American troops attacked the building of the General Staff of the National Defense Forces of Panama in order to seize the commander-in-chief, General Manuel Antonio Noriega. Armed clashes between American and Panamanian troops started in various points of the Panama City. Even before the military operation was over, a White House spokesman said Washington had recognized the new leader of Panama, President Guillermo Endara who is the head of the Panamanian opposition. Comment by Mikhail Mayorov:

What has happened was not unexpected but people hoped it would not happen. Aggression was in the air from the very moment when a dramatic confrontation began between the United States Administration and General Manuel Antonio Noriega who, before these events began, became the head of the Panamanian Government.

Full-scale combat operations erupted early on Wednesday but the war between the largest Western power and the small Latin American country with a population of just over 2 million has been going on for months. There were an economic blockade, rough diplomatic pressure, and muscle flexing.

Morals and politics have been put apart in this case. Let Washington claim General Noriega was involved in the drugs business, let it recall the fact that Panama annulled the returns of the elections held last May 7th. If we call a spade a spade, not a single episode of the Panamanian life can justify the current brazen act of intervention by the United States.

The men who took the decision in the White House were thinking in categories that seemed to have gone for good. Any observer who has even scarce knowledge of the history of the United States' southern neighbors has all of a sudden seen a plot in the classical (?retro) style: The American GI's on foreign soil, Washington justifies the invasion by a need to protect the lives of the U.S. citizens there. Isn't this similar to the events in Grenada in 1983.

As it has been announced, the aim of the action is to restore the democratic process in Panama. So, another case of democracy brought on American bayonets.

The year 1989 has had every chance to go down in history as a crucial one in affirming new political thinking in world affairs. What has happened in Panama on that day in December shortly before Christmas indicates that some policy makers do use now and then stereotypes of the past.

World Condemnation Urged

LD2012132489 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1225 GMT 20 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow, 20 Dec (TASS)—Political Observer Nikolay Chigir writes:

It is no secret to anyone that recently U.S. ruling circles have sharply stepped up their activity against Panama, activity aimed at overthrowing the leadership of that country and establishing orders there in accordance with the interests of Washington politics. This has been written about openly by the U.S. press, and leading figures in the United States have expressed themselves about it frankly. Nonetheless, there was still a flicker of hope that the United States would refrain from using extreme measures and would assess the situation in a sober way, not only in the Central American region but throughout the world, as well, and would embark on the path of realism in accordance with the demands of the new thinking in international relations.

Unfortunately, however, this is not what has happened. No matter under what pretext it was carried out, the U.S. military operation in Panama, which began on the night of 19-20 December, cannot be called anything other than aggression against a sovereign and independent country and full member of the United Nations. At the same time, they have challenged the entire world community and have gone against general human interests. The principles of the UN Charter and generally accepted norms of international law have been flouted.

What we are faced with is a relapse of the notorious "gunboat diplomacy" with the help of which the United States for many decades has tried to transform the countries of Latin America and the Caribbean into its own "backyard." Not one of the "arguments" to which the White House is resorting to justify its military action against Panama stands up to the slightest analysis. They all are merely a collection of old formulas which the United States has used repeatedly to cover up armed interventions against its southern neighbors.

However, even that is not the main thing. Who, one might ask, gave Washington the right to interfere in the internal affairs of other states, and even more so, to use armed force? The declaration on the principles of international law adopted by the UN General Assembly back in 1970 says: "No state or group of states has the right to interfere directly or indirectly for any reason in the internal and foreign affairs of another states." Evidently the U.S. Administration considers that this sacred principle does not extend to its own policy.

The current U.S. intervention in Panama is not only yet another regional conflict, but also a dangerous encroachment on the not-very-stable balance it has been possible to achieve in the world arena. It gives rise to a feeling of profound anxiety. The world community must condemn this U.S. action and demand that the United States halt it immediately.

Congress of People's Deputies

People's Deputies Discuss Second Congress

90UN0476A Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian 12 Dec 89 p 3

["People's Deputies: Words Before the Congress" under the rubric "Politics"; first four paragraphs are editorial introduction]

[Text] Six months have elapsed since the First Congress of USSR People's Deputies, which reflected all the problems, contradictions, pains, and hopes of society. Six months....

We have changed precipitantly since then, but you will that agree the impetus for the recent changes was given precisely at that time in the hot May-June days. Contradictions, extreme viewpoints, a common resolve to get things done, but a differing understanding of what these things in fact are.... At times a deputy's speech at the congress would, like a crystal thrown into a boiling solution, raise whirlwinds of emotions in the country—all would be in a state of excitement, seething and in ferment. And virtually nothing was by chance here. It was as if each speech by a deputy which had such repercussions was due to the breakup of social rocks, causing jolts, devastating for buildings of the old system, but at times no less dangerous for the newly erected structures also, which were concealed, but very perceptible on the surface.

Two lines, two approaches to the reforms were defined at the congress. The first was oriented toward the scientific reconstruction of the foundations of society, the separation and solution of the base problems in policy and the economy, and a clear-cut determination of the priorities and sequence of the steps in perestroyka, without which we will simply become entangled and expend our efforts to no avail in a struggle against details. The other approach was dictated by impatience and intolerance and good intentions, but an absence of any idea of how to implement them in order to avoid destructive consequences. In the period when the congress has been in recess these schools have intensified, the number of their supporters in various social structures has become clearly defined, and the struggle between them in parliament and society has intensified and enjoyed variable success. Nonetheless, in our opinion, the potential of the constructive principle and common sense has increased, albeit very slowly, at times imperceptibly, as a result of these processes.

Today participants in the First Congress of USSR People's Deputies, including those whose position at that time elicited extensive public comment, share their ideas about what lessons, in their view, should be learned from the experience of the first congress, evaluate the parliament's path toward the second congress, and express opinions about what we might expect from the new forum of the people's elect.

Sergey Stankevich, people's deputy of the USSR, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet Legislation, Legality, and Rule of Law Committee

One of the first at the congress to raise the question of the protection of minority rights. A majority of deputies voted against his specific proposal. In favor, 431.

Democracy and Procedure

The problem of formulating a mechanism of consideration of different interests and a search for compromise solutions had only to be broached at the congress for voices to be heard saying: Stop knocking the congress, let's get some work done. What was understood by work here, in the main, was voting for the Presidium's proposals. However, in the course of the congress itself, and to an even greater extent during the work of the Supreme Soviet, the situation changed, in my view. Having taken part in the formulation of specific legislative decisions, the deputies, defending their proposals in plenary sittings, learned the value of procedure as a guarantee of democracy.

This was manifested particularly clearly in the recent parliamentary debate on the standing orders of the congress and the Supreme Soviet. Whereas just one statement at the first congress about the possibility of the creation of an inter-regional group of deputies caused ideological panic, just a matter of a few months later a section in the draft standing orders determining the mechanism of registration of parliamentary groups and the rights and duties of its members was perceived as being the rule.

It gradually came to be understood that the main merit of democratic procedure is its universal and stable nature. If the procedure of the protection of minority rights may be used by this minority regardless of the views it holds, this is normal and just, this is democratic. There should be no such thing as procedure being in the hands of some "leadership" above parliament or the congress.

How will the Second Congress of People's Deputies proceed and how successful will it be in learning lessons from the collisions and states of crisis which the first congress entered at times unpredictably and with a surprising airiness? The new standing orders of the congress prepared by the Supreme Soviet and running to 184 articles will most likely be adopted in full at the end of the congress because if it starts with this, the congress will become bogged down right away. But some serious proposals facilitating the work of the congress will have to be discussed and, certainly, adopted supplementary to the time regulations immediately.

What kind of proposals? The secretariat is being reorganized considerably. This will be a working body formed in accordance with the representation principle, whose main task will be the collection and collation of proposals, observations, inquiries, applications to speak, and so forth. All this will be conveyed in systematized form to the presidium. Each deputy who has submitted an application to speak will receive confirmation and notice of his turn to speak and the time.... Of course, a certain freedom will be given the chairman in granting leave to speak. But it will now be possible to supervise him and to appeal to the secretariat and, finally, to the congress.

Conditions are being created for the work of the groups of deputies and delegations for which the need emerged even at the first congress. Three sections headed by deputy chairmen of the Council of Ministers will be organized. The deputies will have an opportunity to discuss with scientists the most important groups of problems within the framework of the central issue of the congress, "Stages of Economic Reform." Each deputy will be afforded an opportunity to speak in these sections.

The question of stages of the economic reform will be the key issue at the congress. After all, the very strategy of economic reform has been questioned in the course of recent debate. We will once again have to confirm our intentions; are we heading toward a market or not? Are we heading toward forms of management autonomous from the state ultimately predominating in the economy? It is necessary to answer these questions in principle and record in a decree what we will do next year, what in 2 years, and so forth. Questions posed in this form will compel more specific statements on the part of both the supporters and opponents of radical reforms and the initiators of perestroyka themselves.

Aleksandr Obolenskiy, people's deputy of the USSR, member of the Soviet of Nationalities Commission for Consumer Goods, Trade, Utilities, and Other Services

At the First Congress of USSR People's Deputies he ran as an alternative to M.S. Gorbachev for the office of chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet. By majority vote A. Obolenskiy's candidacy was not put on the ballot paper.

Authority of the Highest Power

Offering an alternative candidacy for the office of chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet helped, in my view, the deputies and the electorate supplement the portrait of head of state and finally do away with the hypnosis of the highest office and subsequently **leading** office as such. After all, it was impossible prior to this to even imagine that the holder of the office could be replaced not as the result of intrigues hidden from the people and the manipulations of some "deus ex machina" of the highest power, but as the result of an attempt to avail oneself of democratic procedure in accordance with its direct purpose. So it was not the goal of rivalry with the irrefutable leader which I set in putting forward my candidacy, but the task of doing away with the hypnosis of power, which at that moment, despite all M.S. Gorbachev's democratic character and humanity, nonetheless surrounded him in terms of office.

Direct relay from the congress and then from sittings of the USSR Supreme Soviet also completed this process. People came to see that their leader was primarily a human being. He might make mistakes, get excited, fall to thinking.... And it is this knowledge, in my view, despite all the costs, which has strengthened confidence in the true leadership of Gorbachev among all intelligent supporters of his policy.

Of course, the halo of office could not have been done away with only in the eyes of the people. The same conclusions were drawn also for themselves by the powers that be, those who feel that as a result of the changes and the hypnosis their own power is disappearing. Joining forces with the direct opponents of the reforms, which exist in all social groups of society (we must not deceive ourselves here, imposing the word "people" on some uniform impersonal masses unanimously "supporting changes"), the representatives of various structures endowed with power are organizing demonstrations and mass meetings with antigovernment and antiparliamentary slogans.

Attempting to halt all this would mean starting a struggle against democracy. After all, democracy means that all have equal rights to the expression of their opinion. But democracy should not lead to a permanently unstable state of society. Instability, on the other hand, is created not as the result of the freedom to express any opinion, but as the result of the fear of the supporters of opposite ideas that the authorities could ultimately take the part of some and suppress others. This is where this perception of shakiness in today's political life comes from.

Only a state based on the rule of law, in which, as a result of developed democratic procedures and laws, it becomes impossible for some people to dictate their will to others from a position of strength, can guarantee stability.

The second condition of the democratic solution of contradictions is freedom and independence in obtaining and disseminating information. Whoever possesses information controls the situation and may change it at his discretion. Consequently, we need to ensure that access to sources of information not be usurped by this group or the other and, even less, by those who are in power.

The third guarantee of stability is the citizens' general culture and capacity for evaluating received information, analyzing it, and drawing conclusions. We also need this general culture when we evaluate the merits and shortcomings of our political leader after the hypnosis of power syndrome has finally been done away with.

My attitude toward M.S. Gorbachev has not changed. Neither up to the time of his speech at the congress or since. He has come to be reproached, for example, for the fact that at the congress and since he has "turned to the right." But the congress did, after all, elect him to the state's highest office. Whether he likes it or not, a person in this office is obliged to take into consideration the entire diversity of sentiments in society and refract this entire diversity in his position. What would happen were he, for example, understanding that society is not ready for the adoption of this radical measure or the other, to begin, heeding no objections, to introduce this measure all the same? Or unequivocally adopt the position of some one group? Then you would have instability leading to crisis.

I am convinced that polar viewpoints and the entire spectrum of opinions on this question or the other will always be necessary for the normal work of the Supreme Soviet and the congress. But there will always be a need also to find the golden mean, a compromise solution and people capable of this search. Only thus can we define the direction in which to progress further.

Sergey Chervonopiskiy, people's deputy of the USSR

His assertion in his speech at the first congress that the words "State, Party, Communism!" were and remain sacred elicited the ardent support of a majority at the congress and a highly ambivalent reaction outside of the Kremlin.

The Good Is Always Specific

Even the ancients believed that the main task of both young and old was the ability to distinguish between good and evil. We agree that this task is now urgent. But what is the case in practice? The youth are frequently called upon in formal manner still to follow the example of their fathers. But the examples and the fathers are various. Is it not because what was praised yesterday is today being cursed that there is at times such confusion in young minds? Such leaps are a deep wound in young hearts. Not treating it but primarily preventing such a thing—this, I believe, is a primary task of the educators of the new replacement shift. I shall not, naturally, venture to suggest in detail how this might best be done. But I have been convinced repeatedly: Give the young people more serious work, and the returns will be substantial.

The platform of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee for the elections of people's deputies of the UkSSR [Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic] and the local soviets was published in the republic recently. An important and needed document. But it appeared somewhat late, in my view. Why? All because, I believe, of that same old habit of temporizing. But this is now impermissible: The process of renovation in the Ukraine is progressing ambivalently, and mistakes of the transitional period have, as this document observes, been reflected. We cannot continue at such a level, I believe. The more so in that destructive elements in the situation, which is difficult for the country and the republic, are not letting slip opportunities to direct a destructive blast at our just cause. Repulsing them in good time is an urgent necessity.

We Afghan veterans have liked the fact that since the First Congress of USSR People's Deputies more has come to be done in the republic to ensure that participants in the Great Patriotic War, soldier-internationalists and servicemen, have sensed the maximum of attention to themselves. And it cannot fail to be gratifying that as of 1990-1991 no less than 5% of total living space which is commissioned, regardless of departmental jurisdiction, will be made available to servicemen who have been released into the reserve or who have retired, which will enable them to radically improve their living conditions.

We consider it a rule of ours to give each Komsomol [Leninist Communist Youth League] organization of the city a specific assignment. A youth S&T creativity center has been created with us in Cherkassy. The collectives of the "Azot" and "Rotor" production associations, the chemical agents plant, and other enterprises are helping its branches strengthen and grow.

The "Volcano" and "Young Assault Trooper" associations, where more than 500 adolescents are receiving instruction, have been created on the initiative on the Cherkassy Komsomol City Committee. With the participation of Komsomol members we are tackling the problem of refitting a number of trolley buses for the transportation of invalids. A recent city Komsomol conference adopted the decision to draw up a "Charity" program.

In a word, we are hastening to do good for people. I am sure that returns from our efforts will not be long in coming. They will serve to strengthen our motherland even further and to ensure that our society renew itself even more actively on the paths of perestroyka and democratization.

Yevdokiya Gayer, people's deputy of the USSR, member of the Soviet of Nationalities Nationality Policy and Interethnic Relations Commission.

At the time when an atmosphere of impatience and rejection of Deputy A. Sakharov had been created, she delivered words of support for the academician and condemned the deputies' breaches of elementary ethical standards.

Benefits of Parliamentary Ethics

How much in the way of emotions, hopes, and disappointments there was at the First Congress of People's Deputies! Quite a short amount of time has elapsed since then—merely a moment in the country's history—but look how it has changed all of us. And particularly perceptible, in my view, are the changes in the moral atmosphere which has imbued the work of the Supreme Soviet, our young parliament.

We arrived at the congress wound up, not having cooled down from the heated election struggle, and torn by contradictory interests and an impatient desire for swift changes. Whence, it seems to me, the inordinate intensity of emotions which rendered the speeches of some deputies crude and unfair to others. It is still shameful to recall how Andrey Dmitriyevich Sakharov was "slammed" and how the Moscow delegates were "blocked," on account of which very many people, whom perestroyka needs, failed to become a part of the Supreme Soviet. It is good that they have not retired into themselves in their grievance and are working in parliament actively. It is good that we are learning to hear and listen to one another and are endeavoring increasingly successfully to avoid insulting labels in the debate.

If we think about it, all the unpleasant moments at the congress connected with the departures from ethical standards are not so much the fault as the misfortune of our people and the deputies, as their representatives. More precisely, they are the misfortune of our general lack of knowledgeability, which forms distorted ideas concerning this phenomenon or the other and this personality or group of people or the other.

That same general lack of knowledgeability explains, in my view, the belated attention to ecological problems: We lag 10 or more years even, most likely, behind the developed countries in recognition of their importance for all mankind. And the difficult comprehension of national problems, particularly those of small peoples lacking their own statehood, is also a consequence of the chronic scarcity of information in our society. It is strange and unpleasant for me to hear the primordial human right to the land of one's forebears being interpreted as some feudal claims and an attempt to separate the country into appanage principalities. What is the point of resorting to such offensive words instead of getting to the heart of the problem?

We need to reflect more and weigh up more strictly our every word, particularly words spoken in public. The fact that at the second session there was earnest discussion of the creation of an ethics commission under the auspices of the Supreme Soviet indicates that the deputies are also beginning to adopt a responsible attitude to this aspect of their activity. In addition, the very practice of the Supreme Soviet's work and the strengthening personal contacts are inculcating respect and tolerance. But questions of parliamentary culture are not exhausted by relations within parliament. Our electorate wittingly or unwittingly also influences their formation.

I, for example, receive letters which take me to task for having gone back on my election program and for not insisting, as promised, on a revision of pensions for Far Easterners. I have believed and continue to believe that in our Far East region, which is on a par in terms of conditions with areas of the Far North, all the northern coefficients should be taken into account when the pensions are calculated. But it is not, after all, always possible nor always necessary to defend this viewpoint or the other precisely at plenary sittings which are put out over the air. The main work is done in the committees and commissions, but is not visible to the electorate, although it goes on until midnight at times. And many deputies are receiving letters with similar complaints. Lack of trust hurts and introduces excessive edginess to one's work.

But it is even more unpleasant when one receives letters with insults or threats of the following type: "Do not count on being reelected deputy." As a rule, these letters are unsigned or signed with a false name.

Fortunately, there are few such letters in the overall stream of mail. But there should be none at all in a civilized society. The general level of culture is, after all, reflected in parliamentary debate and in the work of all state and public institutions.

Nonetheless, the short amount of time that has elapsed since the First Congress of People's Deputies has worked for us and for our hopes. Slowly, step by step we have gained experience of both parliamentary work and experience of parliamentary culture. We are becoming more attentive toward opponents, and the applause, which is heard in the hall increasingly less often, is no longer of a "slamming" but approbatory nature. Perhaps it is not all that appropriate even in this case, but the tendency is encouraging, nonetheless....

Aleksey Kazannik, people's deputy of the USSR

At the first congress he resigned as a member of the USSR Supreme Soviet, to which he had already been elected, in favor of USSR People's Deputy B.N. Yeltsin.

Morality and Professionalism

Every people's deputy not elected to the USSR Supreme Soviet has most likely kept a close watch on his work and has his own opinion on this score. I have also. I believe that my forecasts have been fully borne out. At the First Congress of People's Deputies we formed an insufficiently competent USSR Supreme Soviet obedient to the apparatus. Cavalry attacks on the cooperatives and on the regulations governing private ownership and the bills on the economic independence of the Baltic republics and on the development of national languages showed graphically that the majority of deputies have not mastered the rudiments of economics and are not ready to solve complex political and national problems.

The apparatus is guiding the Supreme Soviet insufficiently correctly. Those presiding frequently practice political segregation when granting leave to speak. Intolerable pressure is being put on the temporary commissions of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies. The commissions on political and legal evaluation of the Ribbentrop-Molotov pact and verification of the material connected with the activity of the Gdlyan and Ivanov investigating group are working under extreme conditions.

USSR Supreme Soviet delegations being sent to foreign countries for strengthening parliamentary ties are being put together by the apparatus and are not even nominally being confirmed by the deputies in session. Nonetheless, they are speaking on behalf of the Supreme Soviet. I, for example, was shocked when I learned that a parliamentary group headed by Anatoliy Ivanovich Lukyanov had visited China immediately following the mass execution of demonstrators in the streets and squares of Beijing.

Even in the stagnation period the USSR Supreme Soviet did not examine such dry and weak bills. They are saturated with solemn provisions made for effect and provisions for referring back and compromise wording. There is not a single regulatory provision, for example, in Section 5 of the draft Principles of Land Legislation of the USSR and the Union Republics. Do we need laws, one wonders, which fail to regulate social relationships?!

Article 10 of the same draft submitted for parliamentary discussion has recorded: "Land in places where small peoples and ethnic groups reside may in all instances be confiscated only with the consent of the soviets of people's deputies of these territories." Such a provision could only have been drawn up by specialists who have never been in areas of the Far North and Far East. It is not deputies of the indigenous peoples but representatives of time-servers who have come to "coin it" who are preponderant in the local soviets there.

The sole solution is to enshrine in the law a provision whereby land in the places where small peoples and ethnic groups reside may be confiscated only on the basis of a national referendum, as the published version in fact observes. Only then will we halt the colonial expansion of the ministries and departments and save the small peoples from genocide.

I believe that various groups of deputies—interregional, workers, agrarian, Baltic, Urals, Siberian—should be legislatively made official at the congress. They should be the basis of the organized work of the Congress of People's Deputies and the Supreme Soviet.

The interregional group will submit an alternative program for leading the country out of socioeconomic crisis and solving nationality problems.

Kirill Lavrov, people's deputy of the USSR

He, like many representatives of the artistic intelligentsia, was unable to speak at the congress about problems of culture. It may, perhaps, be maintained that culture has become an anti-hero of the congress. At the same time, however, both at the congress and in the parliament the deputies have seen for themselves every day that they will make no progress without a solution of questions of culture.

Culture Among the Anti-Heroes

I wanted to speak at the first congress, I had prepared for it, I had written a speech, but, alas, my time, as they say, had not come. And today reading through the speech which I did not make, I realize that we need to speak about the state of our culture at the top of our voices.

Let us once again recall D.S. Likhachev at the first congress, who, unfortunately, was the sole person to speak at that time about culture, about saving man's soul. I have realized today that not only cultural figures need to speak about culture at the congress and that culture should be a priority area in perestroyka—the restructuring of man and his regeneration.

We have come up with the definition: "residual principle of the financing of culture," and it seems to us that once the disease has been named, it is as if it had been cured. The magic formula of words—this is also the fruit of our ideologists and propagandists, who have not yet dared clear away from the rooftops the senseless glorification of ourselves. But what lies behind this most notorious "residual principle"? What lies behind it is, perhaps, the most frightening, most ugly consequence of the ideological policy of decades—the lowering of the general culture of the people and the spiritual degradation of the nations.

Priority has always been given emergency, immediate needs. We have lived under extreme conditions for seven decades. Never have we had enough for culture! Putting off culture "until later," we created the conditions for people's mental, spiritual, and cultural degradation. And, in consequence, we are harvesting the fruits—loss of respect for one's work, loss of moral contact between the generations, the disappearance of normal intercourse with one another, and the substitution for true national and cultural values of a set of serviceable chauvinist and nationalist pseudotruths.

I am a Leningrader. And it is intolerably painful for me, a Leningrader, to see how a most unique city of the world—our historical pride!—is being destroyed, and not from floods. And how could it be otherwise if once again there is a lack of money and if hundreds of departments, offices, military organizations, and secret research institutes have loftily set up separately in handsome palaces and private residences seemingly protected by the state for their cultural and historical value, but in fact being destroyed by it, and there is no chance of evicting them. Yet it has long been time to give the palaces and private residences to cultural establishments and, possibly, restore their historical character as quickly as possible.

I long doubted whether we needed an official law on culture. But I now realize that the country cannot get by without one. We need a law in which the leading thought would be: Concern for the utmost elevation of culture is a matter not only for culture officials, it is a nationwide concern.

We need all together to restore the definition "charitable activity" to its original meaning. Charity should be economically encouraged and not punished as it is today, and punished seemingly in the name of the resources being found for satisfaction of man's most essential needs. It is time we understood that the most essential thing for all of us is man's soul.

14 Dec Congressional Section Speeches Reported

Abalkin on Economic Reform

PM2012113189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Dec 89 Morning Edition pp 9-10

[Speech by Deputy Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers L.I. Abalkin during 14 December debates in the Congress of People's Deputies sections]

[Text] L.A. Abalkin, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers. Esteemed comrade people's deputies, we have been discussing for a full day now the problems of reform and the option for the development of reform proposed in the government document. The discussion has brought out various approaches. The various assessments of the proposals in the government program clearly demand certain clarification. Moreover, all the questions which have been raised in speeches and in written notes by people's deputies to the presidium should be answered.

The government's stance on the question of economic reform has been expounded in a pretty clear and definite way, in my view. I will take the liberty of reading the appropriate passage from yesterday's report by the head of government: "The proposals to restrain economic transformations, particularly the abandonment of reform and the return to the old administrative system, are completely unacceptable, in the government's opinion. That route is utterly futile. It will in any event lead us up a dead end. There is no alternative to economic reform."

This stance requires an unambiguous assessment by the Congress of People's Deputies. Does it share this appreciation of the need for and lack of alternative to economic reform for the future of our country or not? Once we have received an answer to this first question, we will be be able to move on, determining which route to pursue, comparing alternative versions of transformations, and setting the pace for their implementation.

The discussion of this question at the congress is not a government initiative. The First Congress of People's Congress instructed the second congress to examine the government report containing an exposition of its economic program. The Supreme Soviet included on the agenda for the present congress a proposal with a specific designation of the topic of the report—"On measures to restore the economy, the stages of economic reform, and fundamental approaches to drafting the 13th 5-Year Plan." The overall concept and stance of the government is concisely laid out in the title of the report which was submitted to the congress yesterday: "Efficiency, consolidation, and reform are the route to a healthy economy." These are the three fundamental features, from the government standpoint, on which I will dwell. So efficiency, consolidation, and reform it is.

It must be said that preparation of the proposals for the congress was carried out in a difficult atmosphere, which could be described as an increase in the uncertainty factor in the development of society and the development of the economy. I am ready to subscribe to every word said here about the fact that we first need laws on ownership, land, taxation, and so forth. But we prepared the report for the congress in the absence of such laws. They have not yet been adopted, certain of them are still in the first-reading stage. Nevertheless, we had to work despite this. I would like to say that we are to a certain extent idealizing the future. The idea has formed that from the actual day we raise our hands to adopt a law everything in life will suddenly change—it doesn't happen that way at all. If it were possible to solve everything immediately by passing laws, that would be a too easy route to recovery. It is very dangerous now to sow the illusion in society that if we prepare this package of laws by the spring session (February-March), life in the country from April on will be quite different.

I want to elucidate this. In the government report we specially stressed the importance of adopting these laws. At the same time we have to do everything necessary to ensure that the new laws make a confident entry into our economic life and have a real impact on it. In short, that they begin to work properly. In other words, all necessary conditions should be created in the country for the practical implementation of the provisions contained in the laws in the shortest time possible. Many people's deputies, including Comrade Lisitskiy, have spoken very well here about the fact that the Law on Taxation won't work without a tax inspectorate. We know what we are contending with and will contend with in the absence of many other highly essential conditions.

But that is only one aspect of the question. The other aspect is bound up with the fact that the economy and society are constantly being destabilized by the strike movement and other mass social movements which are buffeting the economy. Foreseeing the development of events not just for a few years ahead but even for a relatively short period is very difficult. Given this, one should not give promises or guarantees. We should view things realistically. I want to tell you what we have to do in these conditions, what to aim at. We have still not managed to halt the main destabilizing factor in the country's economic development—the excessive growth in monetary income—the income of both the population and enterprises. According to the results of the first 11 months of the year the rate of increase in monetary income amounts to 13% It must be clearly understood that no increase in the output of consumer goods or growth in services can cover a 13-percent growth in monetary income—not in a year or any other period. It must not be forgotten that similar situations are taking shape in the sphere of noncash turnover and the money income of enterprises. Yesterday Nikolay Ivanovich presented two figures side by side: The deferred demand of enterprises (available money in their funds) now amounts to R100 billion, with a state budget planned deficit of R120 billion. This exerts powerful pressure in many respects and determines the tactics of our future "behavior."

There are many questions. They have been expressed in speeches, and I received a note from people's deputies concerning expediters. I will read it out: "Do please tell us whether expediters exist in capitalist countries or whether they are products of socialism? Tell us what resources are spent on their upkeep. The hotels, planes, and trains are chockful of them. What kind of industrial society can we speak of when this ignominious profession exists in our country?"

You can be as indignant as you like about this. But one simple thing stands behind every culture and every reality: If enterprises' monetary demand for material resources substantially exceeds the volume of physical output you will inevitably get shortages, expediters, speculation, the black market, and exchange in kind. We should fight to eliminate not the conseqences but the fundamental causes, seek, that is, to restore the materials-cost equilibrium in the national economy.

"Emergency measures—both administrative and economic—are essential and are dictated by the situation. The most difficult problem is to find and apply those measures which are inevitable at the present stage while not deviating from the overall main thrust of reform. The pace is slowing down, that is obvious, but how can we restore the economy without being sidetracked and diverted from the main route?"

This question was also widely discussed during the recesses. We have no special disagreements regarding ideas about the first-rate model of the economy which will take shape as a result of the reform, about how fine everything there will be, how people will feel they are in charge, how new incentve mechanisms will operate, how the center will smoothly wield the conductor's baton without interfering in the day-to-day running of enterprises or regions, and how efficently resources will be utilized and the environment protected—all that is so. But, unfortunately, my academic colleagues very often conceive all this as if they are faced with a blank sheet of drawing paper on which—unburdened by history, tradition, or the scale of false demand—they are to design a splendid model. But how do we get to this from our present state—from the dead end, the mire, the crisis—any descriptive term may be applied here? How do we move on? We are arguing over these measures and the alternative versions. How are we to proceed, then? It has been said today that we should proceed resolutely. Give us a free, completely unrestricted and unrestrained market, it is said. Unemployment will grow by a few million, some thousands or tens of thousands of enterprises will fold, and people will fall below the poverty line; on the other hand, everything will subsequently come right. However, we must ask ourselves whether society is ready to bear the cost of this option designed to develop the reform? Is it ready to embark on this route? And even if it is, is this the road that leads to the promised land? Or is this an option which we will be unable to sustain? I think that the question of the choice of option is the next thing the congress must discuss. You must appreciate that you cannot just take note that the government, after turning down a number of versions of development, has settled, say, on the third. Taking note is an expression of the will of the congress. But this implies that the decision has been taken by the government. Avoiding assessing and taking decisions means placing the functions of the legislature into the hands of the executive. Putting it bluntly: We are delegating to you the right to take on our behalf a decision on the choice of one of three (or four) options. Someone has to take this decision! Someone has to take the decision in order to advance. We cannot temporize and continue endless discussion. Everything must, of course, be comprehensively discussed here, since those who take the decision also assume responsibility for the consequences.

Let us now turn to more concrete questions. Ownership. This is a central question which has been repeatedly discussed here in various versions. Positions have clarified: Everyone favors a diversity of forms and the creation of equal conditions. Deputy Zubanov in his note asked for clarification of a discrepancy between the written and oral reports delivered by Nikolay Ivanovich: Is it diversity of forms of public ownership or diversity of forms of ownership that is involved? We prepared our proposal based on the draft Law on Ownership prepared for publication. There are questions relating to the proportions assumed by the various forms of ownership—share ownership, lease-based ownership, and so forth. People's Deputy Bunich has said that the proportion of the leasing form of ownership which we put in for 1995—just 20%—is too small. We have to sit down and analyze this together. But how much would you suggest? This question bothers me—after all, you should have a clear idea of what is involved here and what Pavel Grigorevich Bunich has himself repeatedly spoken about. In 1995 the proportion assumed by the leasing form could be considerably down on 1991. Say an enterprise leases property, then buys it out and converts itself into a joint-stock enterprise. But once the enterprise becomes a joint-stock company, it naturally ceases to figure among the lessees. Or suppose it becomes a collective enterprise, which is also in the draft law? Yet you cannot take just leasing enterprises and attempt this comparison. It is simply necessary to look at the whole range of these expressions. There can be many versions. And they can't all be judged by one yardstick.

Moreover, I want to say again that the question of the forms of ownership and their establishment is not simply a matter of adopting a legislative act. It'll take years if not generations to effect real changes in attitudes to ownership (if you are talking about economic relations of ownership) and to establish these changes. One can simply change the name of ownership, that's easy. But if the attitude to ownership is to determine the mechanism whereby man's behavior is motivated, you need a global transformation of society.

The market. Much has been said about the market. And warnings against movement in that direction have been issued today. It is essential to ponder everything over and over again. I will venture to say that in preparing the proposals on developing the market the government was clearly guided by the directive of the First Congress of USSR People's Deputies, which was adopted. I will quote from the resolution of the first congress: "...to carry out the phased transfer in the next few years." (Incidentally, it reads "phased transfer" rather than in a single bound). I will continue the quotation: "The transfer to a wholesale market in the means of production, creating conditions for the formation of a socialist market, including a market in securities and investments. Taking the necessary measures to ensure the extensive development of economic competition and combat monopoly phenomena."

If there are doubts about the market, we have to raise the question of reviewing the decisions of the first congress. Moreover, I am unable either from an academic or a political standpoint to confirm the tenet that the market in any conditions, including those shaping a socialist market, inevitably entails unemployment and other such negative social consequences. This has not been proven, it is merely an assumption quite often voiced in the press by journalists. In principle it serves as one of the theoretical foundations of the attempt to reverse the reform and abandon the course already chosen. Complete clarity is needed here.

At the same time it must be remembered that the market cannot be introduced by decree—it needs definite preparation. It is impossible to introduce a market immediately, given the current financial imbalance, the huge scale of false demand, the maintenance of monopoly structures of production, and the absence on the part of enterprises and producers of any developed sense of being in charge, and without competitive principles existing in the economy. It is quite obvious what this would lead to. The consequences have been forecast and it can be very clearly stated what awaits us. We only have to look at our neighbors who have already tried to do this.

The preparation for the market will require at least 3 years, if we really get down to it. Commodity and stock markets and information and commercial centers are required. The appropriate antinflation and antimonopoly regulators are needed. A whole structure of fundamentally new regulatory bodies, including taxation and financial inspectorates, a price-monitoring inspectorate, and antimonopoly committees, are needed. We need cadres able to work in the new conditions and employ the methods spoken about here. Finally, a reliable system of social protection for the population is needed in conditions of the functioning of the market.

Deputy Ivanov's note speaks about the adverse consequences of the market and expresses anxiety that some people may suffer and even inevitably will. There are social protection functions which do, of course, need to be defined. But this requires the elaboration of a special program. The elaboration of such programs is now under way in the organs of government; however, it is difficult to fulfill them in 3 years, for it is a very complex task which needs to be solved.

It is important to be clear about the principles of social protection: What does the state assume and what does it guarantee. The protection of all the weaker people who are not in a condition to work? The protection of large families and people on low fixed incomes? This whole concept and system of measures of social protection which should be introduced if not before than at least simultaneously with the switch to the market mechanism of economic regulation.

There have been reproaches here: There is no monitoring of government decisions regarding the issuing of money, and this needs to be carried out. People's Deputy Sobchak has spoken about this. Comrades, remember who sought control over the issuing of money? The government did. We said: Tie our hands, don't allow us to issue more than R10 billon next year. Here we promised you R18 billion. We also asked but did not entreat the Supreme Soviet to resist the tempation next year of a R60 billion state budget deficit. Asked but did not get. After all, the deficit does us no good. The more rigorously the scope of government action is limited, the greater the protection enjoyed by the common cause of perestroyka. There are no problems here therefore.

The need for the simultaneous implementation of the reform of prices and taxes is, clearly, obvious enough. It is quite plain that it was scarcely justified or feasible to separate the reform of retail, wholesale, and purchase prices, and also tariffs, and the switch to the new tax system.

Now for the magnitude of taxes. Much has been said about this, we all love those administrative formulas: It's time, people say, to snatch yourself something from the bureaucratic system wherever... Much is said about this, but there is a logic. After all, the Congress of People's Deputies and the Supreme Soviet will be issuing money from the budget to increase the length of leave. Money will be allocated for major statewide environmental programs. Fundamental science will be financed.

I name only what was spoken of in the speeches, without mentioning the means for defense production and for the structure which is taking shape and functioning as a state all-union structure. Thus, the volume of these spheres' requirements for resources determines how much money must first be collected as budget revenue so that it is subsequently possible to use it in the expenditure section. In a few minutes' time I will name the figure which it is proposed to pay out in order to estimate what sum of taxes we have to collect. This must be estimated approximately. Let us then not determine the social program for the time being. Then the need for budget revenue will diminish. Extraordinary situations dictate such questions as the problems of making amortization deductions and the formation of centralized funds. But again account must be taken of the fact that this will happen under conditions of a fundamentally new structure and with the elimination of all centralized deductions which are now made from the ministry's amortization funds, and, according to data given me by the Finance Ministry during the recess, the ministry centralizes in its funds 17% of the amortization deductions for renovation. It is a question of doing this not by means of a sectoral system but of having a single fist of investment resources and gathering them so as to be able to resolve really priority, strategic programs. And all this with a reduction in the total volume of state centralized resources.

There was also the question of appointing leaders. Yes, yesterday the government expounded its understanding of this question with a definite theoretical grounding. The owner determines the procedure for appointing a leader. The owner resolves these questions. If this ownership is collective, cooperative, joint-stock, and so forth, there are collegial principles of appointing and electing, and whatever people want, in the end they do—they appoint or elect, or hire under contract.

But if the owner is the state, it determines the appointment procedure and can delegate its rights. And in accordance with the structure of state ownership this can be union, republic, or municipal, and the selection and appointment of leaders is determined.

Never—neither in the past, nor today, nor in any country of the world—has the owner renounced the function of managing production. This is a fundamental question, and I see no deviation here. Moreover, it must be borne in mind that we have adopted the Law on Labor Conflicts. For there to be a conflict there have to be two sides representing different interests. Let us say, the collective representing its own interests, and the management representing the state's interests.

Can you imagine a labor conflict on a collective farm [kolkhoz] between the kolkhoz members and the kolkhoz chairman? They simply get together and reelect him. There are no sides in the conflict there. Incidentally, this presupposes the existence of a perfectly distinct and clear position.

People's Deputy Nikolaychuk spoke of "Norilsknikel." I too will permit myself. Everyone has the right to a defense. On this question we were clearly guided by the position of the First Congress of People's Deputies, which noted that "it is necessary to promote in every possible way the voluntary creation of socialist concerns, intersectoral associations, unions, and other associations. The development of these forms will make it possible to radically change the functions of ministries and steadily reduce their number." I believe that in creating "Norilsknikel" we were clearly guided by that congress instruction. And, incidentally, it was created in a very hard struggle with the Ministry of Metallurgy, because this concern left the ministry and became an independent, nondepartmental structure. But since it is a monopoly concern (we have defined in our documents that organizations which concentrate in their hands more than 30% of the volume of the domestic market count as monopoly structures), it loses the right to set contract prices.

Everything must be honest here. If this enterprise which functions in the market system has rivals and competes in the market, it can "play" on the price. But if you are a monopolist, then, pardon me, no contract prices—both the state order and the license to export platinum, nickel, gold, and so forth. You must not play here, everything must be honest here. As a people's deputy, Comrade Nikolaychuk, incidentally, participated in the discussion of the draft at all stages. There was a great struggle. I can say (I participated in this matter, although I did not initiate it) that, as always, there was an abundant flow of letters and telegrams—for or against "Norilsknikel"—including from people's deputies. Some were "against" and others "for," but it was necessary at some time to stop somewhere. The last discussion took place at the USSR Council of Ministers Presidium in the presence of Comrade Nikolaychuk, who spoke there. They listened to all the opinions and decided to create it.

The final part of my speech. Here I would like to make use of some figures, to illustrate some things, and to answer some questions. We are now experiencing "in the reform" very strong movements connected with attempts to resolve problems not by creating and augmenting social wealth but by means of sharing and redistribution. Things are proceeding with great difficulty. Perhaps the government report failed to reflect this in sufficiently great relief. Perhaps our position on the close link between efficiency and the resolution of social problems should have been formulated more rigidly. Thus, expenditure in the sum of R57 billion has already been defined for the 13th 5-Year Plan for centralized measures alone which will be financed from the state budget. Everything outlined here is just centralized resources which must be allocated from the budget. Not in one 5-year plan have we subjected more than R25-26 billion to this control.

We are all pleased with and welcome the draft Law on Pensions. But wherein lie the difficulty of the problem and the pain which we must feel? We must be clearly aware that this whole program (like the draft Law on Leave) may be either not fulfilled or fulfilled—but it will still further aggravate the state of affairs in the economy unless it is underpinned by greater production efficiency. That is, we must increase the national income to such an extent that there is enough for everyone, for all other economically accountable purposes, for all regional programs, so that each labor collective is left with its part of the income—and still centralizing such money in the budget.

Thus, if we create such an increase in national income, everything will be all right, but if we do not create it, then we will be unable to pay out this money. But if we pay out all the same, this will lead to a general worsening of the situation in society, because each ruble will simply "lose weight" and become cheaper.

This linkage must be realized very rigidly, be defined with regard to times, and so forth. We were still not fully aware of all this when the budget for 1990, in particular, was approved. It defines expenditure and income, and then it notes that all expenditure will be financed as the state budget income increases. But if this "measure" does not exist, then investment, socioecological, and all other programs will not be financed either. We can put on record that we will channel 80% of the increase in national income into social measures, or 90% into social programs. But whether this will be R5 or R10 billion depends on the total on which this 80 or 90% is calculated.

This concerns certain other questions too. I will now explain. The question of writing off debts has arisen, and today agrarian specialists also understand this question. But all economists know that there is double-entry bookkeeping, a system of double-entry accounting: If you enter it to the debit of one, it is to the credit of another.

What does writing off a kolkhoz's debts mean? It means writing them off as the state's debts and increasing the total of the state debt accordingly. No other source exists. As experience proves, the writing off of any debts at all is a very irrational path which gives rise to freeloading sentiments and leads to a new manifold increase in debts in the hope that they will never have to be paid off. We have already inured people to this.

Therefore the USSR Government has formulated its program very clearly: If leasehold collectives, small cooperatives, peasant farms, and other forms of management are created on the basis of those economic units which are really burdened with debts and unable to extricate themselves from them, then debts are written off when they are created so as not to stymie their development. But this is precisely a measure that can be viewed simultaneously as a measure stimulating reform and pushing it in a progressive direction.

I have received a note which requires explanation. It is signed by three deputies—Lazarev, Tarasov, and Konovalov: "It was stated in Deputy Bobritskiy's speech that at enterprises in the city of Bobruysk, as at other enterprises in the country, the share of wages stands at 8-12 kopeks per ruble of net output. In developed countries it stands at more than 50 kopeks. Where do these 88-92 kopeks go? Please explain—the voters will not understand us. You would think that we must produce a lot of output, but we end up with a budget deficit of more than R100 billion. Is it not the shadow economy that gives us such 'help'?"

Unfortunately, comrades, journalists and certain insufficiently professional economists have recently circulated a mass of analogous figures and calculations which disorient public awareness. They are confirmed neither by actual reality nor by practice. First I will name average figures, and then I will say how this can take shape. Net output is, to put it crudely, wages plus profit. If you set aside everything else. In our industry on average the share of wages in prime costs and profitability norms have an identical level: 13-14%. This means that wages are approximately equal to profit, again roughly speaking. I have already reported these figures to the USSR Supreme Soviet, and I named a more accurate correlation. But if we take the dynamics of the process, today they are "developing in the opposite direction," when wages are growing much faster than net output. I will cite you examples, where indicators were given for 3 years of the 5-year plan (1986-1988), how we planned and what we obtained. If we take the national economy as a whole, we planned to increase national income, and its average annual growth was to stand at 4.2%, while the wages fund was to increase 3.2%. A normal correlation. Thus, 4.2% for national income according to the plan, and 3.2% for the wages fund according to the plan. But the growth in national income in fact stood at 2.8%, while the wages fund increased 6%. Preferential growth increased its share. If we speak of labor productivity, the planned correlation appeared as follows. We planned to increase labor productivity by 4.1% a year, and wages by 2.8%. In fact labor productivity grew at 2.8%, and wages at 5.8%. These are the correlations. As for 1989, the correlation here has increased sharply. Wages are growing 9% a year. This, of course, greatly complicates our economic situation. In conclusion I wish also to say that the chief question now is the search for a solution. I have spoken of efficiency and should, of course, have spoken of scientific and technical progress and of analogous questions with whose help this chief question is being resolved: With the help of these measures is it possible to really improve production efficiency and really accelerate scientific and technical progress? It is here, probably, that there is a very real reserve and a deficiency. We still have to work a very great deal on it so as to show how these levers proposed here resolve the problems.

This question has been put to me: "Greatly esteemed Leonid Ivanovich, please speak about the reality of the figure for financial assistance to the countryside named yesterday by Yegor Kuzmich Ligachev."

I do not wish to speak of figures from memory. To a certain extent it was a question of debating a point formulated in the government report. The government report, delivered yesterday by Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov, formulated the position that, for all the importance of allocating resources for the countryside, the agro-industrial complex is almost the only complex in the country which will receive more resources in this 5-year plan than planned, and despite this it is necessary to continue the priority development of the agrarian sector's material and technical base and to resolve social questions above all. At the same time Nikolay Ivanovich posed the question like this: The government believes that this way of resolving problems in agriculture will not produce the desired results and that the chief thing is still the renewal of production relations.

This is the government's position, which I share entirely. I have said repeatedly before—in particular, on my appointment—eliciting serious criticism, as you will remember, from a number of deputies: The chief thing in the agro-industrial complex, just as in other spheres, is the real renewal of production relations, socialist relations, developing, flexible, efficient.

Yegor Kuzmich's speech contained a direct polemic with this government conclusion. He said (I have heard this repeatedly—I say this from memory, pardon me) that the problem cannot be resolved by the resource method alone, but all the same this is essentially the chief way. I disagree with this point. I share the program set forth in the government report.

Sobchak Slams Ryzhkov Report

PM1912160189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 9

[Speech by Deputy A.A. Sobchak from Vasileostrovskiy Territorial Electoral Okrug, Leningrad City (member of the USSR Supreme Soviet Legislation, Legality, and Law and Order Committee), at the 14 December 1989 session of the section "On Stages of the Economic Reform" of the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies]

[Text] Comrades, I applied to address this section yesterday morning. But, for some reason, alphabetical order is the procedure that has been adopted and so I asked if I could speak earlier.

Approval of the proposed government program for resolving the crisis and improving the economy was expressed very often yesterday. But I would like to offer another opinion: extreme dissatisfaction with the program proposed by the government.

First, because this program does not have firm foundations from the very outset. We have not legally defined our attitude to the basic issues: land, ownership, taxation, and the position of socialist enterprises within the economic system. Without this, the entire program is, forgive me, nothing more than words. And what if tomorrow we adopt a decision (say the Supreme Soviet makes a decision on the basis of the powers that are to be given to it by the second Congress of USSR People's Deputies) on allowing private ownership? This option has been published and so it is now a possible option and solution to the issue. Consequently, everything the government has put to us must be seen in a quite different light. A very great deal depends on this. Either we decide that land is state property, as before, and belongs to the USSR. Or we take another option: that the union and the union republics are the owners of the land. Or we take the third option, on which autonomous formations are insisting: The peoples populating the territory in question are the owners of the land. This will place the government in quite different conditions when specific economic questions are being decided, including in investment and structural policy. It is one thing to decide the question of sitting enterprises from the center and quite another to make this kind of decision only with the consent of the peoples living in the territory in question. That is how it will be on any question.

The second point of dissatisfaction stems from the fact that we—if you will allow me to say so—are not being offered a program with specific stages and a specific mechanism of implementation but another declaration, and, what is more, a declaration which does not even (I am trying to put this as gently as possible) adequately make ends meet. Let us think back to what Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov said yesterday. He said that the main merits of the middle, eclectic option adopted by the government for making the transition from an administrative economy to a market economy are that it makes it possible to stop the growth of the deficit and the slump in production without reverting to administrative measures and that it opens up a real path leading to formation of a market. But that is not true, comrades. The whole point of what the government is now proposing to us and what is already being put into effect is that these are emergency measures implemented by purely administrative methods. Yesterday Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov earned applause when he said that we must review the question of self-management for labor collectives, that we must abandon the practice of electing enterprise leaders, and so on and so forth.

I would like to dwell on this specific issue in order to show how the most reasonable ideas in our real economic and political life can lead to negative, sometimes even absurd results. Let us think back to how enterprise self-management was put into effect. The Law on the State Enterprise had not even come into force, but in December 1987 the government hastened to extend the principle of self-management to all other organizations as well. But a vast amount of thought should have been given to the questions of introducing self-management at enterprises in a whole number of sectors and how to link the activity of an administration based on the principle of one-man management with the principles of self-management by the collective.

And now what is happening? Labor collectives in six sectors have already come up against the fact that self-management and appointment by election are being abolished. Enterprises' leading personnel are constantly being joined by retired party and state workers. As far as I am concerned, this process is one of the most dangerous.

Many of our good intentions and decisions will be canceled out if we abandon self-management now on the basis of the idea that self-management is causing some damage, that discipline must be strengthened, and so forth. Will we not thereby open the way to swelling the leadership of industrial enterprises with incompetent people? We must give a very great deal of thought to how to combine the need for administration and a "firm hand" on enterprises (this is required by production) with self-management. There is a way to do this, which has already been discussed: joint stock, the leasehold system, and labor collectives' purchase of the relevant means of production and transfer to an autonomous existence. It also involves filling the relevant positions on a competitive basis.

That is one of the specific issues. But I am more alarmed by something else. I am alarmed by the fact that, in addition to the absence of a specific mechanism for implementing the stages of the reform and the measures which the government is promising us to improve the financial market and the country's financial situation, the government program is also vague on another point: Is the economic reform to continue? And what is the place of enterprises in this reform?

Please note: In yesterday's report and in the written report presented to us there is no mention of enterprise autonomy or measures to strengthen their economic accountability. Quite different measures are referred to: They are connected with increasing the output of consumer goods, with structural changes, and with improvement of the financial situation. This is all being presented to us as the corresponding innovation and a deepening of reform.

I am a specialist in economic law and I think that many enterprise leaders present here will confirm what I am about to say. You are aware that the chaos in our economy started because we did not know and still do not know which normative acts should be the basis of our economic existence. Let us think back to that package of CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers resolutions that was adopted after the 19th All-Union Party Conference: It contained more than 10 resolutions on every question of economic activity. Has that package of resolutions been put into effect or not? I do not know. No one has canceled those resolutions but, despite that, if we look at the questions of developing the banking and finance system, supplies, and so forth, we have taken a quite different path. There is more. There is the Law on the State Enterprise. Is this in effect today or not? I think that with regard to the majority of its basic provisions designed to broaden enterprise autonomy it simply is not in effect, because the government has gradually removed enterprise autonomy: primarily with regard to setting wages, but also in decisionmaking on a whole series of other issues. I do not have the time to list them all. So, what direction are we taking? At present we have a very clear government program: a wage freeze, a price freeze, and the freezing of that pitiful standard of living we, every one of us, and enterprises as a whole have attained.

The question arises: Does the proposed government program signify, as Pavel Grigoryevich Bunich very delicately put it, a slow return to the old system or a refusal to move forward? I do not think we have had the answer to this question yet, but an answer we must have. I think we must express our dissatisfaction with the proposals the government has made to us. We must demand that the government provide clear, specific recommendations and ideas on how to resolve the crisis. What should we concentrate on first and foremost? I think the first thing we must be guided by when resolving any economic problem—following Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's statement in the article on the socialist ideal—is that the time has come to finally stop imposing ready-made schemes on the economy and to solve every problem of our economic life on the basis of the requirements and progression of real life.

So, what are these requirements? In our country, the main painful issue is agriculture. We must first of all proceed from the need to solve this problem. What do I see as the solution? The problem must be resolved literally from the first day of 1990. I hope that we will nevertheless adopt a decision at the congress on carrying out extensive land reform: This alone will justify the work of the congress. We must exempt the peasantry and agricultural enterprises from taxes and create most-favored status for them until the country is fed and we have all the agricultural produce we need. That is the first point.

The second point: In my view, the "recovery" of the financial market requires special attention. As long as we leave the issue of monetary resources in the hands of the government, we will not see a healthier financial market. Whenever the government needs extra resources, it will set another printing press in motion as it has always done. That is why there has long been an urgent need to remove the banks from the control of executive authority. We must place the right to issue monetary resources in the hands of the USSR Supreme Soviet—the highest body of state authority. We have a great many proposals connected with the question of speeding up our economy's inclusion in the world economy by means of developing various forms of joint enterprises. There are a great many proposals, but unfortunately they are encountering active resistance from our bureaucratic apparatus.

And, finally, the last point. I have three times addressed the USSR Supreme Soviet, but, unlike our esteemed Valentina Semenovna, our Presidium has the wonderful ability to listen to but not hear certain proposals. I am referring to the need for the strictest economy drive with regard to the needs of the state apparatus. Our state apparatus lives a carefree life, hikes its own wages, and creates more and more new subdivisions. I will give you just one example: The elimination of one department in the sphere of foreign economic relations has made it possible to increase the number of personnel engaged in this sphere by almost 40%, because all the ministries and departments have created new foreign economic relations main administrations accordingly or substantially expanded the existing ones. That is how the apparatus solves its problems. Today the most important stage in our reform and the most important stage in restructuring as a whole is to decide whether we, the representatives of the people, will finally solve all problems in the interests of the people or whether the apparatus is going to continue to manipulate us and resolve every problem in its own interests. (Applause)

Sciences Academy's Bunich

PM1912170589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Dec 89 Morning Edition pp 8-9

[Speech by Deputy P.G. Bunich from the USSR Academy of Sciences (Corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences and head of department at the Moscow S. Ordzhonikidze Management Institute), at the 14 December 1989 ssession of the section "On Stages of the Economic Reform" of the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies]

[Text] Esteemed members of the presidium! Esteemed people's deputies! The question we are discussing today is the most important, most paramount, most serious, and, unfortunately, the most difficult question. If we make progress in this matter, it will justify even the absence of any serious progress on other issues. But if the reverse happens and we progress in all the other issues but make no progress in this matter, unfortunately our work could be considered unsatisfactory.

I had not expected the government to embark on such abrupt, emergency measures. In particular, we have become used to the proportion of accumulation in the national income amounting to approximately 25%. Recently it has begun to drop a little. But it would have been hard to predict such a radical step as bringing it down to 10-13%, which is what the government is now proposing.

The government understands the very dangerous point reached by the people and is "sacrificing" heavy industry. In order to live well one day, we have to survive now, and I would like to support this. But we should realize that these extreme actions can only be successful if there is a foundation of economic reform. For two reasons. First, we can allocate a lot of money and make poor use of it. I feel that one could disagree with what Comrade Ligachev said yesterday: All we have to do is allocate money to agriculture and this money will instantly begin to function very well and solve all of agriculture's problems. Nothing of the sort. We have long been aware of how billions disappear into the sands, despite the fact that they have always been allocated. And now, as we can see, even more money is going to be allocated. Only economic reform and interest can really guarantee that this money will be used as it should be.

The second reason. Eventually, these emergency measures will lead us into a new extreme crisis. The only justification for these measures is that there is going to be a period of 2-3 years when we are going to have to muddle through somehow while the economic tree, so to speak, is being cultivated. And then, when the time comes to pay the bills and the debts incurred by these emergency measures, we will have the money to do so.

In other words, once again we are approaching the question of economic reform. Is there economic reform? We have been waiting for it the entire 5-year period. I would like to draw your attention to the fact that 4 years ago a rather sacred issue was raised: Either we have perestroyka or we essentially have the 5-year plan. The view that we should have the 5-year plan prevailed. Now we are reaping the fruits of this viewpoint. We have succeeded in winning 1 year, although I am not even sure that we have managed a total victory. I am referring to the Law on Leaseholding, which comes into force, on paper, in 2 weeks' time. In other words, we have been detached from this concept for 1 year. Perhaps not the whole year, but part of the year, the greater part of the year, we have certainly been detached from it. And now once again we find ourselves at a most critical point: Yes or no? To be or not to be? If it is going to be a 5-year plan based on the old methods and the old principles, then we must realize that we will be fating ourselves again to an absence of economic reform and everything for which the people have been hoping for 5 years. As Raykin said, we do have something. There is no need to say that we can see this 5-year plan here and now, no need to blame the government for the fact that the situation has become worse and that there is no reform but, on the contrary, retrogression. This should not be said. We are not going backwards—we are actually making some progress, but slowly, very slowly.

First there is the question of the market. Of course, it is very easy to make speeches about how we should have a market, but this is futile and meaningless. We have gathered here, in any case, in this auditorium of professionals, where we certainly do not have the right to bandy about such slogans, it is not worthy of us. We must say how, by what mechanism the role of the market is to be strengthened and whether some sort of mechanism is envisaged by the government. We could abolish the state orders—in other words, do away with centralization and introduce a market. Given today's prices, there would be total anarchy in output. It would mean the output of goods which are possibly less needed and the total elimination of the output of goods which the country needs. In other words, it could lead to catastrophe.

But, on the other hand, if we are going to have essentially the same state order that we have had before, then, however it is camouflaged in the government report, we are not really progressing toward a market and the report offers no mechanism for progressing toward a market. But this, so to speak, is one of the main levers of the new economic system, without which it will feel extremely bad.

That we do not have a market here—that we are lacking this component, in other words—is also shown by the fact that we are beginning to have the kind of things that we have not had before. There are probably a lot of economists here and so I would like to be forgiven for the fact that I am going to talk about a purely economic but extremely important question. The government document states that it proposes to take 20% of amortization deductions from all enterprises. This has never been stated before. This really is a most heavy, nightmarish blow. Okay, some sort of taxes have to be introduced—go ahead and introduce them, that is the right thing to do. But if we introduce even harsher taxes, it will no longer be taxation but gratuitous alienation, gratuitous confiscation. The enterprise representatives sitting here know what the taking of this 20% will mean and how they are going to implement reproduction in the future minus 20% of their reproduction resources. We really cannot agree with this. Other, more economic measures could have been stipulated.

We have been promised a 5-year plan based on new methods. So there should also be a law on the new 5-year plan. I am not thinking of a law on figures but laws of methodology. There must be a new law on centralization in general in the country. Probably, before we heard the draft 5-year plan we should have discussed the general principles for leadership of centralization in general. Perhaps then we would have seen that these principles do not suit us. I feel that this is one of the most important laws to which we must now return.

The second very important question is that of introducing new forms of economic management. Comrades, I cannot understand why the government, which has supported us in the Law on Leaseholding, has proposed that over the next 6 years the proportion of leasehold enterprises must reach 20% of the total number of enterprises. But these are small and medium enterprises, so their output will amount to no more than 10%. This means that by the end of the 6 years we will have—forgive me—between 6 and 10% and, in the middle of this period, 2.3%. In that case, why have we bothered to fence off our kitchen gardens? We have simply outlined a new form. Moreover, the other forms do not contain all the mechanisms for forming collective ownership. This is the only law which indicates ways of making the transition from collective ownership to leasehold relations. In this sense, we do not even need a law on ownership. It will merely serve to further legitimize this phenomenon; and suddenly, after the government has supported us and the Supreme Soviet has adopted the Law on Leaseholding with great approval (after all, 90% voted in favor), such a reversal... What do we have? Instead of struggling against the most considerable obstacles in the way of the leasehold system, we are laying the foundations of such a cosmetic leasehold system that one could say it simply does not exist at all. That is how we are acting, without any justification. The Law on Leaseholding is a real form that is in our hands, has been perfected, and can be introduced.

But now allow me, nevertheless, to say a few words about the obstacles standing in the way of the leasehold system. Because if we do not talk about them, not only will we not make the transition to this system on 1 January—we will not even make it later on.

The first obstacle. The enormous resistance from the ministries is growing stronger. Previously, the ministries knew that one enterprise, two, maybe three put up for lease posed no threat to their future. Now, when they have realized that they are threatened by a leasehold system on a massive scale, a quite different situation has taken shape. After all, under the amendments to the Law on the State Enterprise, so-called structural units may transfer to the leasehold system. So now there is intimidation on a massive scale. Either you promise us, they say, that you will never transfer to the leasehold system or we promise you that you will rapidly be deprived of your status as a structural unit. I have received telegrams and letters saying that some have already been stripped of this status. In a quick, hasty, slapdash fashion. These are the kinds of methods they are already beginning to invent, and this inventiveness will grow. That is the first point.

The second obstacle is this. Not one of the union republics has adopted the Law on Leaseholding. And only 2 weeks are left. But what we have adopted is not a law of direct effect. A great deal is not included and not described in it. The government has taken no decision as to which facilities are not liable to lease and which will not be bought back in full.

There is some government draft regarding taxation, and we will discuss this tomorrow. I do not want to rush too far ahead, but I have grave doubts that this is going to be a good document. Very grave doubts... If we do not manage to reach an agreement tomorrow, it will mean that a document of highly dubious quality, so to speak, will be submitted, which could also deal a severe blow to the leasehold system.

I would like to dwell on a question which has a direct bearing on today's meeting. I am referring to the question of prices. Why has the government announced that there will be a nationwide discussion of retail prices in 1990? Surely we must realize that in the present situation this discussion will turn into a demonstration? Not only is the ground not prepared for this kind of discussion but, quite the reverse, the question of the stability of retail prices is being raised.

The next question is about foreign trade. Surely we cannot agree to the fact that this document does not outline the prospects of developing local trade and that there are no prospects of the Soviet Union entering the world economy. Surely this is no trivial matter? How could this have been omitted? It seems to me that some of the banalities—of which there were unfortunately a considerable number in the report and which we listened to with a feeling of growing tedium—could have been omitted instead. And this is after Mikhail Sergeyevich's visit to Malta, after his talks with President Bush.

The last point. Comrades, we have not been given the stages of economic reform, we have only been given some measures which are going to implemented during the next 5-year plan—and the next 5-year plan is certainly not the same thing as stages of economic reform. After all, economic reform will probably span two—perhaps even more than two—5-year plan periods. So, we can name the laws which have to be adopted, but we cannot create the material preconditions necessary for the real introduction of these new stages. It seems to me that we should have confronted the government with the question later, so that we could really be presented with stages of reform, ruble convertibility, and the stages of transition to competition, rather than just papers on this subject. The paperwork can be approved today. But what real steps must society take in order to approach these stages? (Applause)

15 Dec Congress of People's Deputies Proceedings

Arutyunyan Says Ryzhkov Program 'Key'

PM1912161189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Dec 89 Second Edition p 4

[Speech by Deputy S.G. Arutyunyan of Leninakanskiy Territorial Electoral Okrug, Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic, (first secretary of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee) at 15 December morning session of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies]

[Text] Esteemed Comrade Deputies! Our congress is meeting at a complex and difficult, but essentially dramatic time for the destiny of the country and perestroyka. The people have long awaited solutions which will make it possible at long last to untie the tight knot of critically acute socioeconomic and interethnic problems and key problems of the renewal of socialism on a qualitatively new basis. What path will we take? What version of the country's development will we vote for? What pace of renewal will our congress set? It is on this that its success will depend. The success Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev proposed we vote for on the first day of our joint work. Of course, the main purpose of this work is to devise an orderly system of socioeconomic transformations and extricate the economy from the grip of the serious crisis. Why is this the main purpose? Because success in the political and social spheres, in the life of every person, will depend on how things go in the economy. And I believe it is from this standpoint that one must primarily assess the government's report to the congress.

Indeed, the country's government is faced with a very difficult task. To devise a range of new approaches and measures which, on the one hand, will ensure tangible improvements in the people's living conditions and, on the other hand, will provide a sound economic foundation for this improvement and make it possible to halt the development of crisis phenomena and processes, stabilize the consumer market and money circulation, and stop the budget deficit from swelling. Does the government program meet these vital demands? In principle, yes. Above all, I would single out some positive approaches that are of importance today. They are the realistic and well-founded nature of the proposed measures on tackling the tasks currently confronting the national economy. There is also the clear and unequivocal orientation toward social priorities. Finally, the resolute step toward forming and developing a socialist market, and creating the desired look [oblik] for the economy, based on renewed ownership relations. In short, the program presented by Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov, despite the criticism here both from the right and from the left, essentially breathes new life into perestroyka in the economy, upholds radical economic reform, and provides the key to extricating the national economy from the quagmire of stagnation and crisis.

But, at the same time, one is bound to notice that the program does not provide a fully elaborated, clear, and precise mechanism for implementing the tactical and strategic goals of the country's future socioeconomic development. In my view, it also lacks a multidimensional, broad vision of the difficulties we can expect to meet on the way to a new, self-regulating, socialist economy. The concept shows a lack of synchronization in the formation of the key elements of the new economic relations. At any rate, the impression is of a failure to coordinate the dates of and procedures for the implementation of price reform, the formation of a market in means of production, the creation of legal and economic guarantees, and vigorous foreign economic activity at the level of union republics, territories, and enterprises. But the experience of perestroyka in the economy that has been accumulated so far shows that unless this work is comprehensive, coordinated, and systematic, it will not bear fruit. Moreover, there is a danger that the very idea of a new economic model will be discredited.

Another serious problem is the social consequences, the social price of deepening the radical economic reform. There is much here that remains unclear and undecided. For example, what form will social relations take in conditions of the reinterpretation of the criteria of social justice, the criteria of social equality? How do you surmount the still massive obstacles of conservatism, inertia, the leveling impulse, populist elements, and freeloading? These are realities that cannot be ignored.

It is well known that the socialist countries, which have moved further than we have along the path of market relations, are now experiencing great difficulties because the planning and market principles have not been regulated. Sources of heightened social tension and political cataclysms have developed there. We should take a close look at their experience to avoid making the same mistakes. Obviously, we will not be able to create immediately, overnight, well-oiled mechanisms for the democratic management of social relations making it possible to eliminate problems and contradictions relatively painlessly. In these conditions we must be prepared for situations in which the negative consequences of particular changes outstrip the positive advances and create an unfavorable backdrop of social tension, as happened, for example, in the case of cooperatives. There is an urgent need here for the elaboration of deeply thought-out measures to provide social protection for the individual.

The ideology of radical reform is inconceivable unless our economic system ceases to be closed and the process of its integration in the world economy is accelerated. And this applies not only to the national economy as a whole, but to each union republic's economy. The establishment of guarantees of and the proper conditions for the switch to an open system of management is an objective necessity. And for our republic this is not just a necessity, but an essential and vital need.

That is why we are so persistent in raising the question of introducing the principles of free enterprise and creating most-favored status in order to attract foreign investment. But there remain great difficulties in creating joint ventures and forming and utilizing foreign currency resources.

Organizational structures and the numerous institutions involved in foreign economic activities are being restructured only slowly. An efficient system for training and retraining cadres in this sphere has not been established, and the introduction of new mechanisms to provide the legal-organizational and diplomatic support for foreign economic links has been delayed. It is hard to find an explanation for this. After all, there have been more than enough political decisions on this. So why are they not being implemented? Why does the long overdue question of a free enterprise zone in Armenia remain unanswered? It is time it was finally decided; people in the republic, particularly in the disaster area, expect it.

I have talked before about the exceptionally complex situation in which Armenia finds itself. Grave economic disarray, exacerbated social and national dissatisfaction, the catastrophic consequences of the natural disaster, and the intractable problems associated with accommodating 220,000 refugees are interwoven here. Not to mention the permanent blockade, which is a factor exerting strong-arm pressure and is undermining not only the republic's economy.

Extreme conditions require extreme measures. Therefore, before setting about restoring the health of the republic's economy, we have to revive it and put it on its feet. It is a year since disaster struck in Armenia. The social tension caused by the earthquake shows no sign of abating. New problems are occurring all the time. And they are due not only to the organizational disarray. Other factors are an imprecisely defined strategy for eliminating the aftermath of the earthquake, insufficient consideration of foreign experience, and the absence of an economic mechanism in the country for managing emergencies.

At the moment we are in a situation where the annual target for the construction of housing and other social facilities in the disaster area has been only 10% fulfilled. Hundreds of thousands of people are still without a roof over their heads and are spending their second winter in extremely grim conditions. We are well aware of the impact of the earthquake aftermath on the country's economy. And, of course, we consider it our duty to mobilize as much of our internal potential as possible. Much remains to be done in the republic in order to accomplish this. The bitter experience of eliminating the aftermath of earthquakes has confirmed once again that the economic independence of the sovereign republics and the fundamental provisions determining the integrity of the USSR as a single multinational state must combine flexibly in the economic development model.

The earthquake in Armenia and the Chernobyl tragedy also persuade one that the country must have a single statewide system for handling emergencies in one region or another. Steps are currently being taken in this sphere. But an integrated system to handle emergencies has not been set up yet.

It is no secret that the perestroyka of management in our country has encountered unforeseen extra-economic circumstances, disruptive factors. There have been strikes, violations of labor discipline, rampant mismanagement, and an increase in crime. Not to mention such unprecedented phenomena as the economic blockade and the blocking of railroads and highways. I appeal to the USSR people's deputies: A blockade is not an act that can be disregarded. In our republic we are affected by its consequences every day, every hour. It is difficult, indeed, impossible for us to explain to people how a self-respecting state can tolerate such a situation. We believe that the Congress of USSR People's Deputies should condemn this kind of act as incompatible with the principles of the Soviet federation.

The country's organs of state power must impose harsh economic sanctions on republics that violate their obligations to the union, with full compensation for the damage caused. Suffice it to say that the total national economic damage as a result of the illegal act against Armenia is over R1.5 billion. But can one measure the moral and psychological damage?

The dialectical relationship between the economy and politics is more topical than ever today. Without political stabilization amd without the elimination of acute interethnic conflicts it is difficult to implement the envisaged economic transformations. Unfortunately, the situation in our region remains extremely tense and explosive. It has become even more incandescent since the adoption of the USSR Supreme Soviet resolution "On Measures To Normalize the Situation in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast" 28 November. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev noted at the present congress that this resolution was not accepted by either side. Our republic's Supreme Soviet unanimously declared that the resolution was not in keeping with the prevailing situation and was therefore unacceptable.

Please understand us correctly, we are seeking truth and justice, not enemies. I realize that many people are tired of the issue, but it involves people's futures, it involves the people. And no matter how hard it might be, it is necessary to consider it comprehensively and calmly and find the key to a settlement of the conflict and normalization of the situation. Thank you for your attention.

Kirghiz Deputy Endorses Ryzhkov Report

PM1912174389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Dec 89 Second Edition p 4

[Speech by A. Dzhumagulov (Sulyuktinskiy National Territorial Electoral Okrug, Kirghiz Soviet Socialist Republic) at the 15 December morning session of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies]

[Text] Esteemed comrade people's deputies! Evidently, many of us have regularly contemplated the meaning and purpose of perestroyka and wondered, especially of late, where we are going and what results we can expect from the reforms. And, clearly, we have not always found clear, unequivocal answers.

Comrade Ryzhkov's report, which is a prospectus for the further deepening of the economic reform and fundamental approaches to the formation of the 13th 5-Year Plan, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's speech, which was delivered a little earlier, and indeed the present congress, in the opinion of the vast majority of deputies from Kirghizia, have answered many questions. How, by what means, and in what timeframe can the country be led out of the impasse? What are the features of the report? Constructiveness, consistency, openness, and judicious boldness in taking difficult decisions. Concern for Soviet people is the main component. While supporting in the main the program presented by the government, the third version of the development strategy, I would like to express a few of my own thoughts.

I am convinced that, while adhering in the main to the general prospectus, we in the union republics must adopt a creative approach to devising regional development programs. They will take into account local features and conditions. Our republic's prospectus coincides with that of the union, in terms of the major directions and parameters. At the same time, in our view, we in the republic would be making a bad mistake if we were to inhibit the development of basic sectors of the economy.

Certainly, the priorities given to food, consumer goods, and the social sphere are justified in view of the current dire living conditions for the people. In Kirghizia at the moment more than 85,000 families are waiting for housing in cities and settlements alone. Another 24,000 are living in dilapidated and dangerous homes. There are many in the republic's capital, in the city of Osh, and in the mining cities. There is an acute shortage of schools. Some 40% of pupils study on second or third shifts. Hospitals and polyclinics are in a very bad way. Roads are bad. Many rural population centers do not even have water supplies. The level of provision of gas supplies is extremely low. We consider it a matter of honor to tackle these questions and we wholly support the government's prospectus in relation to this.

But, at the same time, we must also develop the basic sectors amd increase the potential for solving the food problem and the problems of the social sphere. I am talking about hydroelectric power, nonferrous metallurgy, precious metals, and land reclamation.

Kirghizia's hydroelectric power potential is over 140 billion kilowatt-hours, of which only 6.6% has been assimilated so far. And we supply to neighbors nearly one-half of the cheapest electricity we produce. There is an acute shortage of electricity in the region. The power-worker ratio, particularly in agriculture, is extremely low in our republic too.

Nonferrous and precious metals, tin, and tungsten could be currency for the country, as well as being very valuable raw materials. But as far as one knows, we actually use currency to buy tin. If, comrades, we are unable to develop these fields in the very near future through our own efforts and using our own resources, then allow us to consider enlisting foreign firms and setting up joint ventures, using high technology.

Another question. While supporting in principle the high rate of reduction of metals- and energy-intensiveness laid down in the prospectus, one would like the congress to instruct the USSR Academy of Sciences, State Committee for Science and Technology, and State Planning Committee to adopt immediate measures specifically to implement them. Why? We have set this kind of rate before, but, unfortunately, have only achieved 2-4%. From the viewpoint of normal evolutionary approaches, things would appear to be going pretty well in the republic. During the 12th 5-Year Plan production of nonfood goods increased by 41%; however, the expected breakthrough in the commodity market did not occur. In fact, errors in implementing the economic reform, in combating drunkenness and alcoholism, and in the cooperative movement, unequal growth of pay, the gray economy, overt speculation, the declining prestige of labor, and hasty resolutions unfortunately have given rise to inflation and increased shortages of many goods and are neutralizing the positive changes are evident in industry. These questions are emphasized in Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov's report. We must all resolutely back the course of eliminating errors, including those in the exploitation of material resources.

But there are many of them. Here is an example. Disproportions have brought about a situation whereby, despite a manpower surplus, 89% of fur pelts from sheep (including those that are being exported for a song), 93% of the wool yarn, and 88% of the woolen cloth are leaving the republic—in the form of raw material or, at best, semimanufactures. For example, take fine wool—a most valuable product, of which the republic is the third biggest producer in the country. From 1 kg of this wool you can make a quality suit, the price of which, it is no secret, is high, and steadily rising. But we sell 1 kg of wool for only R8-10, for peanuts, virtually. Yet this involves a year of hard work by the shepherd, who is paid a pittance and has no proper amenities. That is why we are pressing for an accelerated review of wholesale, purchase, and retail prices. They are extremely unfair at the moment and do not stimulate agricultural production.

I also want to mention the extremely poor material base for enterprises producing consumer goods. For example, light and local industry, which supplies 60% of the republic's nonfood consumer goods, accounts for only 9.3% of all industrial production fixed capital. The situation is no better, again because of an equipment shortage, in the processing of vegetables, fruit, berries, leather, and fur. A lack of refrigerator installations means that we lose a lot.

In 1990 consumer goods production in the republic is to increase by 17%, including a 24% increase in the production of nonfood goods. A tough plan, but we are not complaining. All we ask is that the USSR State Planning Committee and USSR State Committee for Material and Technical Supply ensure provision of the full complement of material and technical resources, on a properly balanced basis. Unfortunately, hitherto, despite repeated requests, the ministries have not been doing so. Here is an example. The "Kirgizavtomash" Association had its 1990 consumer goods production plan increased eightfold by the Ministry of Automotive and Agricultural Machine Building, but no backup measures were adopted. All it got was the following instructions: Trailers for K-700 tractors and trucks are to be sold on the market. But no one is taking them, because the prices are exorbitant. What ordinary lessee is going to buy one for R33,000? There is a similar situation at enterprises of the USSR Ministry of the Electrical Equipment Industry and Instrument Making, the USSR Ministry of the Shipbuilding Industry, and some others.

The employment issue. Unfortunately, more than 100,000 people are currently unemployed in the republic. We ourselves found the opportunities. We vacated a number of administrative buildings and installed modules, in order to be able to establish 40 light industry enterprises' branches in 18 months-2 years. All we asked for was an allocation of 3,350 sewing machines for them. But all we got from the Ukraine was 300, used ones at that. This is no good, of course.

Here is another instance of crossed wires. A government resolution authorizes us to have direct foreign economic links. Two nonferrous metallurgy combines in the republic decided to sell their above-plan products, mercury and antimony, to the FRG and other countries through the USSR Ministry of Foreign Economic Relations and use the currency they earn to buy equipment for consumer goods production. The ministry spent a long time considering the matter and in the end turned it down, or, to be more accurate, introduced licensing. The republic has the country's biggest stocks of mercury and is the leading producer. But the people at the top reckon that these stocks should be left where they are, doing nothing. Given such an approach, it will be hard for us to carry out the reform and boost the economy.

Esteemed comrades, Soviet people, our electorate, expect a great deal of the congress, and we have no right to disappoint them. There is nowhere to retreat to. If we can find ways of tackling today's problems we will overcome the crisis and make progress. If we cannot, we will kill perestroyka. Therefore it is necessary to support the government's prospectus and give the USSR Council of Ministers the opportunity to work creatively.

We are required to show discipline and a highly developed sense of responsibility, work hard and very productively, engage in healthy rivalry, behave in an orderly manner, display sincere and real concern for economic and cultural development, and develop real friendship and cooperation. This we see as our chief task and we will work hard to accomplish it. Thank you for listening.

Gidaspov Makes Leningrad Comparison

PM2012112589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
18 Dec 89 Second Edition p 3

[Speech by Deputy B.V. Gidaspov of Petrogradskiy Territorial Electoral Okrug, Leningrad City, (first secretary of Leningrad party oblast and city committees), at 15 December evening session of the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies]

[Text] Esteemed colleagues! Esteemed chairman! The highly important legislative acts adopted at the last USSR Supreme Soviet session and the program put forward by the government to improve the health of the economy are, in our view, enforced and temporary measures. In the recesses between sessions we have met several times in various forms and in different groups of deputies—Leningraders and non-Leningraders—we have discussed and debated until we were hoarse, but, to be honest, no one could suggest any real alternative to the government program. But at the same time the government's report does not provide answers to many fundamental questions, first and foremost the mechanism for practically eliminating the existing disproportions. We have somehow now become accustomed to our ability to put forward slogans and set ourselves goals, but at the last moment we forget how to achieve those goals.

It is convenient for me to examine the situation in the country using the example of the Leningrad region. The Leningrad region is an important vantage point from which to view the the country's problems and all the merits and shortcomings of what we are doing, because in our region they appear perhaps even more harshly than in other regions. Leningrad is fulfilling its historic mission. We developed machine building and a power industry and created more and more new examples of defense equipment. Leningrad produced whatever the country needed. I do not think that this should be regarded as a historical error. This really was the mission of our city, and it has fulfilled and will continue to fulfill this mission.

But what result did this have? To develop such a colossal industry we were constantly forced to attract extra workers. Vast enterprises and our machine building complexes were located in the center of the city. We built gigantic, architecturally hideous districts. At the same time our countryside became deserted. The result was an inverted economy.

I am not going to complain, as many speakers here have done, but nevertheless I have to say that 55% of the fixed capital in the center of Leningrad alone is worn out. The volumes and pace of the reconstruction and capital repair of the housing stock, of which we have 15 million square meters in the city center alone, are disastrously low. And the most lamentable thing is that buildings in the historic city center, the architectural jewels of the world, are decaying. Leningraders' living conditions are terrible, and this is especially true of the descendants of the workers of Petersburg, the intellectual elite—scientists, artists, and writers—and, particularly distressingly, those who lived through the blockade. Leningraders know that I often quote this example. If you take as your center the cathedral spire of the Peter and Paul Fortress and draw a circle with a 1 km radius around it, you will find that there are around 1 million people living there in communal apartments. Yet that is where our greatest scientific, technical, and production potential is located.

Leningrad has unfortunately fallen to one of the lowest places among our country's major cities and republics. I am not going to enumerate at length here, I shall merely say that in hospital bed provision we are in 71st place and in terms of movie theaters we are 73d. The situation in public education has become very bad. I totally agree with Deputy Ryzhov, who spoke before me, that we do not pay proper attention to the education sphere.

It is time to change our slogans. We always said that children are our future. Nothing of the sort. Children are our present, and if we do not care for the public education sphere now our country will of course suffer great and very serious harm in the future. Almost 100,000 schoolchildren in the city and oblast go to school on the second shift. And we still cannot achieve a situation in which retired teachers, including very many real Petrograd and Leningrad intellectuals, can be paid a wage and still retain their pension.

The attention paid to cultural development has slackened because of the lack of resources. Many unique, world-famous monuments in Leningrad and the oblast are going to ruin. Many deputies have spoken more about the problems of their republics and cities than about what we ourselves intend to do to remedy this situation. After all, we cannot constantly burden the center with our cares and problems or demand more and more investments.

In these complex economic conditions the Leningrad region is fulfilling its pledges and seeking ways to solve the problems by making maximum use of its own intellectual and technical potential. To change the city's tragic situation—I can find no other word for it—Leningraders have elaborated, widely discussed, and adopted a program for the city's reconstruction. In particular, it envisages the extensive development of Soviet and international tourism and the restoration of cultural and educational establishments. We ask the USSR Council of Ministers—clearly, there is no avoiding making requests—to give Leningrad the opportunity for revival that it needs so much and to adopt a relevant government resolution, the draft of which we have already prepared and coordinated at all levels.

Incidentally, this applies not only to Leningrad but the whole country. A system of economic incentives for all regions and cities in which the tourist industry could have a very great effect should have been created long ago. That applies to Kiev, Samarkand, Bukhara, the Baltic republics, and very many other regions as well.

We see an opportunity to change the prevailing situation by drastically limiting industrial construction and using the capacities and resources thus freed to resolve social problems. Progress seemed to be being made today. In conjunction with the USSR State Planning Committee, via the aforementioned measures, R70 million were found, but the decisions remained on paper. Everything is completely blocked by ministries and departments. I could cite many examples. At one installation of the "Kirovskiy Zavod" Production Association, for example, we could have spent only R9 million instead of R23 million and could have used the rest to resolve our social tasks. But the plan for production construction envisages the spending of R23.6 million. I hope the Kirov workers won't hold it against me, but that's how it is.

In the 1990 plan we have a smaller volume of capital investments for the development of the social infrastructure than there was per year in the 10th, 11th, and 12th 5-Year Plans. That is wrong.

The nub of our proposal is that territories, together with central planning organs, could form the capital construction plan for all enterprises and organizations regardless of their departmental affiliation, without detriment, of course, to increased production volumes. This isn't a question of replacing one departmental diktat by another, territorial, diktat. No. We are sensible people, we have economists, managers, and production workers within the territory who can do this job. I believe that this will be very beneficial to the country as a whole.

The government's proposals on the implementation of a package of major, one-shot measures aimed at creating a market still do not contain a clear approach to the creation of a mechanism to regulate it. We are going through a very complex transitional stage now. I understand this clearly both as a former economic manager and when I came up against the problems of Leningrad and the oblast in a completely different capacity in these past months. Now I look at them differently. But, in our opinion, the key to the problem at the present stage is the search for ways to best combine state management and the independence of labor collectives. It must only be a combination. Otherwise we will surely not resolve the current situation. In other words, you cannot abandon the levers of state regulation until all the objective conditions for that have been created. In the transitional period actions must be synchronized. This is a question not so much and not only of a technically well thought-out action program so much as of a perestroyka of the consciousness and attitude of millions of people toward what we are doing. After all, not everyone understands what is going on in our country now. And the process of developing the new thinking and the new consciousness will take much long and hard work. For example, we cannot say that the Law on the State Enterprise as a whole is bad. However, individual provisions of it on internal production relations clearly contradict the existing economic mechanism.

Let us take the election of the economic leadership. This has already been said here—it is an obstacle to the recruitment of competent people and does not shape the new economic thinking. I personally espouse that view. At large state enterprises it is necessary to hire leaders, not just appoint them but actually hire them. Lease collectives and cooperatives—that is where elections can reign. That is the natural course of events, so to speak.

Clarification is also needed regarding the provisions on the powers of labor collective councils and other social organizations, I am not going to list them all. We have created a very great many of them at enterprises recently.

Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov's report correctly showed how to further deepen economic accountability. However, present experience shows that with the expansion of economic accountability we have increasingly often begun to meet manifestations of group egoism and a desire for unearned income. Generally speaking, these methods are well known to everyone, we know how to use them.

This is particularly pernicious now that we are switching everywhere to the principles of regional economic accountability. In the republics and various oblasts of the country many types of nonfood goods and foodstuffs are being distributed even now on the basis of passports and coupons. Indeed, people are openly talking about the universal introduction of a ration card system.

In switching to the principles of self-sufficiency, many regions are disrupting supplies of output to the union and republic stocks. This is bound to happen, it was inevitable. I shall cite Leningrad's example again. This year alone it failed to receive 40,000 tonnes of meat from the Baltic, 80,000 tonnes of fruit from Moldavia, the Ukraine, and the Transcaucasus, and so on. The terms that are presented when direct contracts are concluded are simply absurd: For example, for the supply of industrial rubber goods people demand the construction of an apartment block, sometimes even two or three. Yet we also supply the aforementioned republics with machine building, electrical engineering, petrochemical, and other types of output and will continue to do so, mindful that this is necessary for labor collectives and, most importantly, for the consumer.

Economically accountable relations cannot be introduced without the proper organization of state regulation. The dismantling of the administrative edict system and the perestroyka of the economic mechanism demand new organizational structures destroying the existing monopoly system. We have created such structures, as you know, in the form of consortiums independent of ministries and we are continuing that work.

Conversion is a separate issue. This is very important for Leningrad because we have many defense enterprises. Conversion, which began in 1989 without a definition of the fundamental approaches, upset the production plans of enterprises in the defense complex. Furthermore, it coincided with the transfer to full economic accountability and self-financing. In addition to the growing economic confusion in the national economic complex the task of conversion was an extra heavy burden on the collectives of state enterprises. Once again we are not waiting for others to solve these problems for us. We set up "Konvent," an economically accountable subunit working on conversion questions in Leningrad and our whole region, and a very great deal has already been done in this direction: Our defense enterprises are producing progressive equipment for the processing industry and for agricultural needs. We shall resolve most of these questions ourselves. However, decisions are needed on a statewide scale, too.

One last point. All that has been proposed is acceptable except one thing—the sequence and timing of the adoption of legislative acts. It is unacceptable that the Law on the Socialist Enterprise will enter into force in 1991 and amendments to the Law on the Cooperative System in 1990. The law on the lease will enter effect next year and it is planned that the law on local self-management will be adopted, too. However, the adoption of legislative acts on price formation and a uniform taxation system have been postponed for a year. The laws on the amendment of our constitution have also been deferred.

I have a son. I hope that I will have grandsons, too. I think that my grandsons will also have children and I wouldn't want them to blame me, as one of those involved in preparing these acts, for the fact that we adopted ill-considered decisions, that we were hasty, and as a result did not achieve what we set out to do. I pin my hopes on common sense and on the fact that in a very short time we will elaborate a strategy—both economic and political—that will not cause us to feel shame before the future generation. Thank you.

Irkutsk's Potapov on Ryzhkov Program

PM1912113989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
17 Dec 89 Second Edition p 5

[Speech by Deputy V.I. Potapov, Cheremkhovskiy territorial electoral okrug, Irkutsk Oblast (first secretary of

Irkutsk Oblast CPSU Committee), at 15 December evening session of second Congress of USSR People's Deputies]

[Excerpts] [Passage omitted] I must note that the consumer and distribution aspect has recently been starting to dominate in the country's economic life to the detriment of priority for creation as the most important source of the growth of material prosperity. I realize that we are not free in choosing options, that we are being pressured by the working people's just dissatisfaction with the growing deficits and the rise in the cost of living. At the same time we must realize that current advantages can result in more tangible losses for the country tomorrow. I believe that in the concept of socioeconomic development we must arrange the emphases to ensure that prospects accord with the fundamental natural laws of the development of production.

I do not mention other important avenues, but paramount attention must be paid to questions of scientific and technical progress and the ensuring of the necessary conditions for increasing production's science-intensiveness. We must not forget the people's saying: If we do not have enough to eat today the future generation will not know, but if we make it a generation of "extraterrestrials" with regard to its contemporaries in the civilized world, it will never forgive us.

In assuming tough commitments the government must also be concerned for the corresponding guarantees. The main calculation is on involving economic levers, and that is absolutely correct. But in my view economic measures to normalize the social situation and the consumer market must be backed up by considered and, I want to stress this particularly, profoundly thought out measures to introduce order and discipline in the country. Incidentally, among the working class, peasantry, and many other strata of the population there are no doubts on this score. But so far no adequate reaction is to be observed on the part of the government.

In this connection democracy in a number of spheres of life is acquiring what I would call a caricature nature. In the labor collectives it is frequently individuals, idlers, and demagogues who rule the roost and there is a sharp decline in the prestige of sensible collective and personal leadership and any managerial decision. Low labor and executive discipline is undermining the foundations of production and destroying relations within the collective and between economic facilities. The present interpretation of the law on the state enterprise with regard to the elective system for appointing economic leaders. It accords to a greater degree with fashion and with democratization with an artificial cover. I agree with Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov's proposal that we should return to this law. But here we should proceed not from its mechanical repeal, we should change the law's actual ideological thrust. Its content should not be how to elect a leader but how he should be answerable for his deeds. I am not militating for discipline with repressions but I include in this concept the necessity which should be inherent in it and which exists in any civilized country. It should exist especially under socialism. The task is not to take measures for individual emergencies, as has been and is the case in connection with the "rail war" in Azerbaijan and Armenia, but to launch a nationwide movement—with, I stress, a binding legal structure—against irresponsibility and slovenliness.

We often ecstatically bestow fine epithets on the West's system [khozyaystvo] and economy. But few people emphasize that there is no labor anarchy there, that the power of economic interests, the power of execution and discipline works there. I am sure that our young democracy loses nothing from that but on the contrary gains much. The democracy which is isolated from the concrete economy and promotes the further process of emptying the store shelves will not be a living democracy. In this connection we must seek to fill in the enormous shortage of morality, competence, and humanity. Nor should we forget in this connection subsidies for the development of education and culture. After all, it is known that this has been the main concern of any state since ancient times.

I propose that on behalf of the Congress of People's Deputies the USSR Council of Ministers and the relevant parliamentary committees and commissions be instructed to prepare and submit for examination by the next session of the USSR Supreme Soviet proposals for the recovery of the social situation and the consolidation of discipline, especially in production. And as a whole to introduce order in society it is essential to create what is truly a rule-of-law state. We must accelerate the elaboration of the draft of the new USSR Constitution. [passage omitted]

To end, I believe it essential to support the third version of the program proposed by the USSR Government. In my view it is more constructive and vital. At the same time I also want to stress that the thesis program given here by Comrade Yeltsin in terms of its economic content in many respects coincides with the ideas of the government program, only it uses different words and is formulated in an emotional manner. At the same time it is not without general appeals presented in a democratic package, which distracts from a creative mood.

Shalayev Gives Trade Union Position

PM1912145389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Dec 89 Second Edition p 6

[Speech by S.A. Shalayev (chairman of All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions) from USSR trade unions at 15 December evening session of the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies]

[Text] Esteemed comrade people's deputies! Allow me to set forth the position of the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions [AUCCTU] and the group of people's deputies from the trade unions on the main avenues for economic recovery submitted in Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov's report.

What do we support unconditionally in the concept of the USSR Council of Ministers? Above all the more resolute social reorientation of the economy outlined in the third version of the concept. The concentration of material and technical potential should lead to an improvement in the people's living standard, to an improvement on the consumer market. In the present very complex social and political situation there is no alternative. The trade unions' proposals on this problem were voiced at the 19th All-Union party conference, the First Congress of USSR People's Deputies, and at meetings with the government. They have been reflected sufficiently fully in the concept. For the next few years it is planned to increase to 89-90% the proportion of the national revenue channeled into current consumption and nonproduction construction. Without that it is impossible to resolve the most acute social problems. Problems like increasing the size of pensions, subsidies, and leave, rendering assistance to the badly off, and a number of others. Major advances in the national economy's structure in favor of group "B"—that means the acceleration of housing and sociocultural building and state priority for tasks connected with developing health care and ensuring ecological safety.

The feasibility of what has been planned depends largely on how our economy develops and on how we work. Here too we do not share either the robust optimism nor the most profound pessimism voiced in individual speeches. It is perfectly obvious that economic recovery should be pursued more radically, more boldly. In the concept submitted we should like to see a more clear-cut, stronger stance on the government's part and its resolve firmly to implement the line toward expanding the economic and legal autonomy of enterprises, kolkhozes, and cooperatives and their responsibility to society and the country for the results of their economic activity.

That now is the linchpin of the entire problem. It was primarily this autonomy which the miners were seeking in those hot July days of mass strikes which literally shook our economy and our awareness. Here I should like to note in particular that it is not a case of parasitism: The miners and the working people of other sectors of the national economy want, through better and free economic management, to gain the opportunity to work more productively and to earn more both for themselves and for the country, city, or region. They want to receive wages in accordance with their labor for specific end results. In our opinion the government must think how to reduce the period of operation of the emergency measures for the stringent taxation on the growth of the wages fund which does perhaps help to stabilize money circulation but which is at the same time a very grave delaying factor in the development of new forms of economic management and lease relations, a delaying factor in increasing the production of the output the country needs, especially in the sectors which determine scientific and technical progress.

I support those deputies who advocate the speediest adoption of fundamental laws on the economic autonomy of enterprises and territories. We need laws on the socialist enterprise, on a single tax system, on local self-management, on common principles for the leadership of the economy and the social sphere in the union and autonomous republics. The USSR Supreme Soviet, the USSR Government, and the trade unions have the opportunity to ensure the broad discussion of the drafts of these laws in the collectives as early as December and January so that they are able not in spring but in late January and early February, at a special session of the Supreme Soviet, to discuss them comprehensively and adopt them with a consideration for the opinion of the working people. For this our group supports the proposal to convene a special session of the USSR Supreme Soviet. We cannot defer the adoption of these laws if we want to give oxygen to the economic reform and, most important, scope for the initiative of the masses who will give the country thousands of new Travkins, Fedorovs, Starodubtsevs, Bocharovs, and other innovators. The laws on the land and ownership are so fundamental that in our opinion they must be submitted to a nationwide referendum on the basis of whose results they must be examined and adopted at the next Congress of USSR People's Deputies.

We often criticize our economic mechanism for failing to prompt enterprises and sectors to introduce new equipment and progressive technology and to save resources, that is to do what comprises the basis of progress.

The congress discussed mainly incentives. Without denying their importance I should like to draw your attention to the main thing—to the formation in our country of a qualitatively new class of working people, highly cultured, professionally educated, committed and capable of rapidly introducing everything which the scientific and technical revolution entails: computerization, information technology, biotechnology, and other components of this revolution. This task is of exceptional importance not only for the acceleration of the economy's development and the solution of social tasks on this basis but also ultimately for the destiny of perestroyka.

We can create supermodern equipment and 21st century technology ourselves or buy it, but who will master it and under what conditions? And it is not only a case of studying but also of creating a new standard of production conditions and labor culture and discipline, of humanizing, so to speak, the entire complex of production relations.

What is the result? Capitalism, interested in developing its own production forces, has been able to train new workers in good time for the new stage of scientific and technical progress. But we, repeating for many years that man is the main production force and that concern for the working man is our central task, are still engaged in these questions as though they were incidental. On this score too we lack a harmonious concept. The plans and programs bypass this question, except perhaps for the corps of managerial cadres.

Comrade deputies! I ask you to pay attention to the fact that over 15 million people in the country are employed in work with unfavorable labor conditions. Many people, including women, work under conditions which simply degrade human dignity.

It is painful to read and hear publicity to the effect that the West is ready to sell us second-hand equipment for a moderate price. The equipment which they themselves no longer want to use but offer us to accelerate our economic development. For many years we believed and indeed to this day many people continue to believe that it is possible to compensate for poor working conditions with high wages, a preferential pension, or extended leave. Here they ignore enormous social reserves like increasing production efficiency and investing large sums in the all-around development of the worker and the humanization of the labor process and conditions. We are firmly convinced that a major turn toward those values, as rapidly as possible, is needed in the Soviet state's socioeconomic policy. A generous increase, on a priority basis, in material expenditure for these purposes at the expense of the state and of enterprises will have the highest return coefficient. Highly developed countries have already proved that.

One more acute social problem is the employment of manpower resources and unemployment. We are perturbed that it was not adequately reflected in the government proposals. Considering that this misfortune is also advancing on us it is essential to elaborate a specific, clear program which will ensure universal and effective employment of the population.

We cannot slow down under conditions where unemployment has become a real fact in a whole number of regions of the country and the cause of many negative phenomena giving rise to social tension. If we began perestroyka in the interests of man and not at the expense of man, then questions of man's employment, the growth of his professional skill, and prompt aid in retraining should be resolved in good time at both state and local level, while providing social guarantees. Any attempts to justify theoretically the possibility and even the need for unemployment in our country are categorically denied by the trade unions.

We consider inadequate the measures aimed at the struggle against inflation, which affects primarily the badly off strata of the population. In the present situation a strict anti-inflationary law is needed which reliably protects Soviet man against the rise in the cost of living and against the consequences of inflation. It is a case of the legislative establishment, as of next year, of a minimum living wage, of the procedure for calculating the prices increase index, on whose basis the incomes of various categories of the population should be regulated, and a number of other measures. The AUCCTU is prepared to take part in the elaboration of such a law.

About the comprehensive reform of the price formation system. Considering that prices in our country are indeed a very deformed and confused category, we support the proposal to carry out such a reform in the immediate future, beginning with wholesale and purchase prices. Without this reform it is indeed impossible to enter into the 13th 5-Year Plan and impossible to organize genuine economically accountable [khozraschetnnyye] relations, to form a commodities and services market, or to give economic autonomy to union republics and enterprises. But since the reform of wholesale and purchase prices will inevitably lead also to an increase in retail prices in trade, here we must provide for special measures for the social protection of the population.

As for the reform of retail prices, the AUCCTU's position here is unambiguous. This reform should be prepared particularly painstakingly. It can be implemented only when and only if the majority of the population expresses itself in favor of a fair and comprehensible program for this reform in the course of a nationwide referendum. Here full compensation should be envisaged for losses from the growth of retail prices for all groups of the population.

Esteemed comrades! You have probably noticed that both in the mass media and among our deputy colleagues rebukes have been heard directed against the trade unions for trying to put pressure on the government: They are demanding that it stabilize the consumer market, freeze prices, stop speculation by the trade and purchasing cooperatives, and so forth.

Appeals are being heard for our government to be protected from such pressure, for more trust to be placed in it in this emergency period, for support to be given to it, for consideration to be given to the fact that we ourselves formed it very recently.

As you can see, we now believe that the measures proposed by the USSR Council of Ministers for the economy's recovery and further development do not satisfy the trade unions in all respects.

At the same time, considering the emergency situation and the exceptional complexity of the present economic and social situation in the country, we deem it necessary, with a consideration for the comments and proposals voiced at the Congress, to support the government and its program for emerging from the crisis and resolving urgent social problems so that the government can continue more confidently its work on the recovery and development of the economy and the preparation of the plan for the 13th 5-Year Plan with a consideration for the comments and proposals voiced at the Congress of USSR People's Deputies.

Aware of their responsibility, the trade unions will take a direct part in the implementation of this program.

Our deputies from the trade unions asked me to say one more thing.

Esteemed Mikhail Sergeyevich, the Semipalatinsk workers have sent you, U.S. President Mr Bush, and our Congress an appeal on the complete cessation of nuclear tests at the Semipalatinsk and Nevada testing grounds, an appeal to continue more actively talks on this question at summit level and between the USSR Supreme Soviet and the U.S. Congress and Senate in order, through joint efforts, to accelerate the solution of this problem of vital importance to use and to all peoples of the world. On behalf of the people's deputies and the trade unions we express support for this appeal and for the appeal from Deputy Filippov regarding Novaya Zemlya.

And a point of information. The day before yesterday Deputy Mikhail Chokkayevich Zalikhanov criticized the AUCCTU in connection with the allegedly incorrect economic relations between the tourism center in the Elbrus region and the AUCCTU. I want to announce that the AUCCTU receives absolutely no funds from tourist organizations, including from Kabardino-Balkaria. On the contrary, the trade unions assist them in their development.

About the Elbrus tourism council specifically. In the past 10 years of the profit it has received from economic activity the republican tourism council has paid the central council R4.6 million while the center has returned R19 million to the Elbrus region to finance the construction of hotel facilities, housing, hostels, children's institutions, and other projects. R4.6 million and R19 million. As you can see, the present economic relationships are obviously imperfect and I agree they must be rectified. Of course, with a consideration for the interests of local organs, with a consideration for the self financing and self-management of tourist centers and organizations. We are prepared to have a special discussion of these questions with Mikhail Chokkayevich Zalikhanov and other comrades from Kabardino-Balkaria.

Tajikistan's Pallayev

PM2012115189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Dec 89 Second Edition p 7

[Speech by Deputy G. Pallayev from Vakhshskiy national territorial electoral okrug, Tajik Soviet Socialist Republic (chairman of Tajik Supreme Soviet Presidium) at 15 December evening session of Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies]

[Text] Esteemed comrade deputies! Soviet people pin great hopes on our second congress. They expect us to find ways of resolving the problems which have accumulated.

I must say that the final goals of the 13th 5-Year Plan set forth in Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov's report will in my view be able to justify these expectations of our society. If, of course, the tasks formulated for the next 3 years are fulfilled unconditionally. The majority of deputies from our republic adhere to this viewpoint.

We believe that the program for the recovery of the economy, the fundamental approaches toward the elaboration of the 13th 5-Year Plan, and the definition of the stages of the economic reform basically accord with present-day tasks. I have in mind the variation which includes the instructions of the First Congress of USSR People's Deputies. Although some deputies sharply criticized the USSR Council of Ministers. And in many ways I agree with that criticism. But I want to say that in the given situation, when the fundamental economic laws for our society's development have not been adopted, it would be unrealistic to expect the report to be delivered in a different key.

The program for the country's development submitted by the government in our opinion contains no integral or interconnected picture for leading the economy to new qualitative parameters through a system of urgent measures. While basically supporting the concept of the gradual implementation of radical economic reform, I believe at the same time that we cannot agree with the claim that the measures taken for 1990 will mark a substantial shift in economic policy. As I understand it the forthcoming year will be defined by the process of the formation and introduction of the system of necessary organizational and legal, economic, and other measures and they in turn will make it possible for us to confidently embark upon subsequent stages of the 13th 5-Year Plan.

It seems to me that we should not simplify the situation which has taken shape or count on rapid changes. The burden of unresolved problems is too great. This can also be judged from our republic. But first I should like to express the following thought: Some people's deputies have formed the opinion that representatives of the Central Asian republics are conservative, that they have no problems and that they agree to everything. That is not so, comrades.

Indeed, we treat the USSR Government with the utmost objectivity and see its difficulties and complexities: To give to one person it has to take from another. But the USSR Government does not always take that into account. Surely, in order to achieve some entirely justified demands, you do not have to thump the table or threaten to leave the Union, as some people are doing? I do not think that is the method to use.

In a federative state everyone must be attentive toward each other, considering the specific features of each union republic. After all, what is the result? Today Tajikistan in many respects lags behind the average union level. Thus, the provision of housing per inhabitant in the republic is the lowest in the country. The volume of consumer goods production per inhabitant is no more than 43% of the all-union level. Similar figures could be cited for health care, culture, and other fields in the social sphere.

A grave situation has taken shape in the country. But why? This question is complex and no simple answer can be given to it. Of course, we are primarily to blame. We have paid little attention to the solution of social questions. But nor can we remove responsibility from the union organs. I should like to support the speech delivered by Comrade Mirkasymov, chairman of the Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Council of Ministers, who suggested revising purchases prices for cotton fiber. For the cotton sowing republics this is of vital importance. Indeed, comrades, surely it is not normal that Tajikistan, first, has no opportunity for processing and obtaining final output for such a labor-intensive crop as cotton and, second, sells raw cotton very cheaply? That is the main reason for the extremely low living standard of our republic's working people.

In the plan for 1990 we have provided for a number of extraordinary measures, but we realize that the knot of existing problems cannot be cut at a stroke. For instance, according to economists' calculations, merely to overcome its lag behind the average union level the national income in our republic must grow twice as quickly in the next 10 years as it is growing now. And how can this be ensured? Right now we have elaborated a draft republican concept for switching to self-management and self financing and we are extremely interested in ensuring that all-union legislation on the union republics' economic autonomy be put into operation as soon as possible.

Within the framework of the radical economic reform and the socioeconomic policy for the development of territories, we should, in our opinion, renounce the use of the following terms in legislative, normative, and other official documents: territorial, regional, and republican economic accountability [khozraschet]. Economic accountability is a commodity-money relations category in which we cannot include all the diversity of forms of interaction between territories in a federative state. Especially as the realities of our life convince us of the need to elaborate and implement general state programs.

For instance, there is the problem of the employment of the able-bodied population, very acute for the Central Asian republics. To resolve this problem we suggest accelerating the creation of new work places through the organization of a developed system of medium and small production facilities and branches making it possible to attract primarily our young people to individual labor. In this connection I should like to mention the well-known CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers resolution on the fundamental improvement of the ecological situation in the Aral Sea region. As a whole this is a necessary and important document but in our view it is compiled in a stereotyped way, without considering the interests and features of the republics of this region.

After all, each problem must be approached in a differentiated way. It is essential to consider that in the neighboring Central Asian republics there is 100-150% more irrigated land per capita than in Tajikistan, where 93% of the territory consists of mountains and only 7% of land suitable for growing agricultural crops. But none of this is taken into account. According to the abovementioned resolution in the past 2 years the commissioning of new irrigated land in our republic has declined by over 10,000 hectares through the Tajikistan State Construction Committee alone. And as of 1991 it is ceasing completely. You ask: How are we to continue to live? After all, for us irrigated land is as important as air, without it we cannot resolve the problem of supplying the population with food and ensuring employment for manpower resources. That is why we have been obliged to appeal to the leadership of the party and soviet organs of Kalinin Oblast, Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR], asking that it lease land to our republic. And the Kalinin Oblast people have agreed. But that is only a partial solution of the problem. It seems to us that we must return to the resolution on the Aral Sea and revise some of its provisions.

For instance, in the opinion of specialists, merely by stepping up the regime of thrift in using water resources it is possible to develop something like 120,000 hectares of new land and, most important, bring tens of thousands of unemployed people into production. So why should people not meet us halfway on this issue? At the same time we are sure that the program for the national employment of the able-bodied population of the Central Asian region and a number of other regions of the country should be a statewide program in nature. And the republics' efforts should become part of that program within the framework of expanding interethnic relations. We believe that in the new 5-year plan we should ensure the maximum scope for maneuver and for expanding the rights of the union republics with a consideration for their features.

In this connection we cannot fail to draw attention to the fact that the government program which has been set out does not reflect the structural basis for the implementation of the projected measures. We are very perturbed by the halfhearted nature of the solutions proposed today, particularly for the so-called transitional period. For instance, there is no reason to abandon the strategic task of switching from distribution to a regulated market. But today's dual solution of many questions is frankly perplexing. Why is there talk of the utmost seriousness of some gradual change to some prices and tariffs? Obviously this will lead to nothing except additional difficulties in economic relationships. Without a reform of prices and price formation genuine economic accountability remains an unrealisable dream. We know that the USSR State Committee for Prices has elaborated a concept for this reform. It must be published for nationwide discussion. The tougher the criticism, the better the results will be.

The material provision of a substantial volume of construction work is already being implemented through direct ties. Thus, our republic's State Construction Committee has been allocated only 85% of cement quotas yet at the same time a state order of 95% of its capacity has been set for the "Tadzhiktsement" production association. The same has been done for the country's other cement production facilities. The question naturally arises: But with whom are we to conclude direct contracts? And in general where are the games organized by the USSR State Planning Committee and the USSR State Material and Technical Supply Committee leading under the conditions of drastic shortage and monopoly?

Nor can we fail to be alarmed by the fact that the volume of consumer goods production planned for 1990 is not backed up by resources, despite the government's repeated assurances. We suggest that the question of material and technical supply in the transitional period be the subject of a special discussion in the government with the participation of representatives of the union republic councils of ministers. The USSR Council of Ministers must be instructed to submit a detailed report on this question to the spring session of the USSR Supreme Soviet in 1990.

In conclusion I want to say that I support the strategic line of economic reform proposed by the government. But at the same time I believe that many of its tactical provisions must be fundamentally reworked with a consideration for the proposals submitted by the deputies. This should be reflected in the congress decisions.

Bashkir Deputy on Parlous State of Rail Network

PM1912105189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
18 Dec 89 Second Edition p 4

[Speech by Deputy R.Kh. Khabibullin from Tuymazinskiy Territorial Electoral Okrug, Bashkir Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic (first secretary of Bashkir Oblast party committee), at 16 December 1989 morning session of the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies]

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] Now about a very painful question—railroad transport. The situation which has taken shape in our republic today can only be described as a breakdown. Judge for yourselves: Since the beginning of the year the Bashkir section of the railroad has not received approximately 87,000 empty tank cars. As a result 1.7 million tonnes of gasoline, diesel fuel, and other petroleum products have not been dispatched in accordance with the production plan. We are a whole 2 months behind. What question can there be of improving production efficiency or introducing the economic reform in petrochemical enterprises when, because of this state of affairs with the dispatch of finished products, they have lost commodity output to the tune of R70 million and had a shortfall of R14 million in profits and economic incentive funds? And how much has also been lost by those who have given up waiting for this fuel?

Repeated appeals to the Ministry of Railways and to Comrades Konarev, Voronin, and Ryzhkov by plant collectives, the republic Council of Ministers, and the party oblast committee remain unanswered. It was only after the personal intervention of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev that railroad workers rectified the situation somewhat in the last 10 day-period of October, but their ardor sufficed for only 10 days. November ended with a failure such as we have never had before. The work of all five plants in the republic was virtually paralyzed. If even personal intervention by the head of state sufficed only for such a short time, you can imagine the degree of degradation of our railroad. It is time the country's government took urgent, very tough measures to restore the fitness for work of railroad transport, and playing at democracy is out of place here. Without this there can be no question of improving the country's economy.

Comrades! People are tired of laxity and disorder. You might say that they yearn for order and organization. Our voters quite rightly demand an end to manifestations of anarchy and the use of the force of law against persons who encroach upon the foundations of our system. I propose the adoption by the congress of a special appeal to the citizens of the Soviet Union, urging the whole population to be imbued with a sense of responsibility, to display a considered and prudent approach, to protect the government and state organs from strong-arm pressure on the part of malignants and various bawlers, and to give them an opportunity to work confidently and resolutely. Public awareness must be turned toward an understanding of a simple truth: The way out of the crisis lies only in high discipline and organization, in strenuous creative labor, and in our daily practical deeds. Thank you for your attention.

Ryzhkov Plan Reflects 'Real Possibilities'

PM2012144789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
18 Dec 89 Second Edition p 1

[Georgiy Ovcharenko "Political Diary": Today, Now...."]

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] Judging by the letters and telephone calls received at the editorial office it sometimes seems to some people that the Congress is following the old conservative track: The government has proposed a 5-year program for the country's socioeconomic development which the delegates adopted on the whole; they are only competing to see who will get a bigger slice of the budget pie for his region, sector, or department. There are those who say that the "silent majority" are virtually wrecking the radical economic reform. Where, they say, are the alternatives to the government program for improving the country's economy?

But let us recall that this time the government program presented to the Congress was prepared on a fundamentally new basis. As N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, stressed, it was chosen from a package of alternative and multiple-option comparisons, calculations, and drafts. There is none of the old secrecy in the elaboration of plans and current measures to improve the economy. Many hundreds of scientists and practical workers took part in creating them. All the proposals underwent the most painstaking examination in the committees and commissions of the USSR Supreme Soviet chambers. This work continued at the Congress, too, in sections there. All this gives grounds for claiming that the new economic program takes into account the country's real possibilities, clearly defines the stages of progress, and provides guidelines for the future.

Our present day situation demands that decisions be realistic so as to achieve the results anticipated in them. And then go further. Yes, very rapid and fundamental improvements in the economy and the level of our well being are very desirable. But we will not forget the lessons of the past: The impatience and the various promises, based on reckless "probably's" and casual "maybe's," simply slowed down our progress and created social tension in society.

"...Whether renewed socialism is to be or not," said the CPSU Central Committee Appeal to the Soviet people published the day that the second Congress opened, "is decided primarily in the socioeconomic sphere." This thesis has been adopted by the people and by the deputies. The first step toward its implementation has been taken—a program of measures to improve the economy has been formulated, the stages of the economic reform have been planned, the 13th 5-Year Plan targets have been compiled. This was not easy. However, its implementation will be even harder. But that is the main task for the present.

Let us not delay or postpone its solution. Recalling the sage's answer, our life and our future are determined by each day we have lived. So let us begin today, right now...!

Moscow TV Relays 19 Dec Congressional Session

1300 GMT

LD1912135189

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1300 GMT on 19 December begins carrying a recorded relay of the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies morning session in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow. As the relay begins, the deputies and presidium are seen taking their seats.

At 1303 GMT, Gorbachev opens the session. He asks the constitution commission to start work immediately. Now the congress' decision on measures to improve the economy is to be adopted. Slyunkov will read a draft decision.

At 1305 GMT, Slyunkov comes to the rostrum. He describes discussion of the report. All proposals by deputies have been examined. The majority of deputies supported Ryzhkov's program. Corresponding laws should be adopted to speed up the economic reform.

At 1312 GMT, Gorbachev asks if there are corrections to the draft decision.

At 1313, Ogarok speaks. He criticizes the interregional group for its negative attitude to the draft plan, especially Deputy Filshin. There is no alternative to the government's draft.

At 1318, Deputy Kozin suggests amendments to various clauses of the draft decision.

At 1321, Deputy Kalninsh suggests additional amendments.

At 1325, Deputy Fisinin says the agro-industrial complex and agriculture should be given more attention, as should basic sciences.

At 1327, Deputy Kadannikov says we are not prepared for market relations. The government should be given more assistance and the draft should be adopted.

At 1330, Deputy Romanov says there is no alternative to the government draft program and we must support it.

1333 GMT

LD1912151889

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1333 GMT on 19 December continues its recorded relay of the morning session of the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow.

Deputy Veprev says agrarian questions are not properly elaborated in the program. The program cannot be fulfilled without strengthening discipline in the country. The government should be given special powers for this.

At 1335 GMT, Deputy Antonavichyus suggests amendments to the draft decision regarding strikes and interethnic conflicts. Leasing is not a progressiv method, he says.

At 1339, Gorbachev interrupts him and invites Aytmatov to speak.

At 1340, Aytmatov says culture is neglected in the draft.

At 1343, Deputy Tsyplayev submits amendments to the draft.

At 1335, Deputy Yaroshinskaya says the law on the press should be examined together with other laws. A nationwide program for eliminating the consequences of the Chernobyl accident should be adotped. Applause is heard.

At 1349, Deputy Boyko says he is disappointed with the second draft decision. there are too many meaningless words in it. The first draft was much better. Directive methods and economic reform do not tie up in the draft.

At 1353, Deputy Kirillov says the antidrinking campaign was one of the causes of the economic crisis. The monopolism of ministries is another cause.

At 1356, Deputy Saunin says our economy is in crisis, extraordinary measures should be adopted. The government should be given room to manuver.

At 1400, Deputy Admiral Chernavin says he disagrees with Arbatov's stand. One should not try to avoid responsibility. The draft decision should be approved.

At 1402, Deputy Desyatov remarks on ecological problems. A referendum on monetary reform should be held, he says.

At 1405, Deputy Chabanov says we should approve that we agree on.

At 1410, Deputy Matyukhin says passions are being deliberately whipped up. The government should give more care to railway transport in the draft decision. Arbatov has always been giving advice but was never called to account for his activity.

At 1413, Deputy Filshin argues with Ogarkov and asserts that calculations in his alternative decision were correct. Ogakov just tried to defend the government from a professional evaluation of its activity.

At 1417, an unidentified deputy urges support for the draft program.

At 1421, Deputy Petropavlovskiy makes suggestions on the state order.

At 1421, Gorbachev names deputies who wrote in their notes that the debates should be ended and the issue put to a vote. There are two options: whether to adopt the program or only to take cognizance of it. Voices from the floor are heard saying that rejection should be a third option.

1426 GMT

LD1912152689

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1426 GMT on 19 December continues its recorded relay of the morning session of the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow.

Deputy Andreyev says there were views during the discussion expressing lack of confidence in the government. I suggest a concrete formulation for voting: No confidence in the government and returning the program for further elaboration.

At 1429 GMT, Gorbachev puts to a vote whether to halt the debate. For 1,569; against 375; abstained 27.

At 1433, Ryzhkov comes to the rostrum: a detailed decision was adopted at the First Congress. The congress should not avoid an evaluation of the program. There should be two options, either for or against, and no middle option which is only confusing.

At 1436, Gorbachev puts to a vote the government's program. He reiterates the three options. First, there is voting on whether ballot by name should be held in this case. For 1,922; against 48; abstained 8.

At 1442, Gorbachev puts the program to a vote, either in support or against, no third option suggested. For 1532; against 419; abstained 44

At 1446, the hall applauds. Ryzhkov bows from his seat.

At 1447, Gorbachev puts the second option to a vote. Confusion in the hall. Gorbachev clarifies that they have to vote all amendments, so now they have to vote on whether simply to take cognizance of the program. For 389; against 1,532; abstained 64.

At 1451, Gorbachev puts the third option to the vote: to reject the program and to demand the resignation of bad ministers. For 199; against 1,685; abstained 98.

At 1455, Gorbachev puts to a vote whether to take the first version of the draft decision as opposed to the second one as a basis for further work. For 1,106; against 769; abstained 96. The first version adopted.

At 1459, voices from the floor express concern over lack of quorum during voting. Gorbachev gives clarifications.

At 1503, Gdlyan, from the rostrum, says he disagrees with Gorbachev's proposal to proceed from the number of those registered at the congress when evaluating a majority.

At 1506, Stankevich suggests an amendment to the standing orders.

At 1507, a 30-minute break is called.

1523 GMT

LD1912163989

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1523 GMT on 19 December begins its recorded relay of the afternoon session of the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow, with Gorbachev in the chair.

Deputy Samarin seeks clarifications on what should be considered a majority. Deputy Alferov, Deputy Olekas, and an unidentified deputy also refer to this.

At 1529 GMT, Gorbachev answers questions from the floor on the same subject. Decisions on procedural matters can be adopted by a majority of those present at the session and not necessarily of the total number of deputies, as formulated by Sobchak and Stankevich. The motion is put to a vote. For 1,505; against 412; abstained 70.

At 1537, Gorbachev puts to the vote the first version of the draft decision, in the light of the latest vote. For 1,422; against 486; abstained 78.

At 1542, Gorbachev proposes that the constitution commission should continue work. Everybody agrees.

At 1543, Arbatov from the rostrum refers to the railwayman who criticized him and asks him to come up to the rostrum and explain his allegations otherwise arbatov will have to take him to court for slander.

At 1545, Gorbachev invites Lukyanov to chair the session.

At 1546, it is proposed to put Article 100 on nominating candidates to a vote. An amendment suggested by burlatskiy is read out. Other amendments are read.

At 1556, question from the floor asks why public organizations are not equal?

At 1557, Lukyanov refers the question to the appropriate commissions.

At 1558 a question from a military official on the right of servicemen to be nominated. Lukyanov gives clarifications.

At 1600, Lukyanov puts to the vote Article 100 as submitted by the commission; amendments to be voted later. For 1,801; against 140; abstained 54.

At 1603, an amendment on initiative groups being entitled to nominate candidates by collecting a certain number of signatures, burlatskiy amendment, is put to the vote. For 528; against 1,418; abstained 73.

At 1608, an amendment is submitted by Yevtushenko that any number of candidates, but no fewer than two candidates can be nominated. Deputy Stadnik suggests his formulation of the same amendment. Voting on Yevtushenko's amendment. For 515; against 1,457; abstained 40.

At 1616, an amendment by Stadnik that any number of candidates, but greater than the number of mandates, is put to the vote. For 484; against 1,436; abstained 71.

At 1619, Lukyanov reads an amendment on financing election campaigns. The amendment is not carried due to lack of a majority.

1624 GMT

LD1912174189

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1624 GMT on 19 December continues its recorded relay of the afternoon session of the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow.

At 1624 GMT, Deputy Yudin from Magadan oblast, suggests another amendment to the wording of Article 100. The deputies vote, and the amendment is rejected.

At 1629, Lukyanov reads the new wording of Article 101. The deputies vote: For 1,929; against 28; abstained 25. The amendment is carried.

Lukyanov puts to a vote an amendment affecting three articles. The deputies vote: For 1,935; against 25; abstained 14. the amendment is carried.

At 1638, Lukyanov puts Articles 143 and 144 to the vote. The deputies vote: for 1,929; against 15; abstained 24. The articles are carried.

At 1643, Lukyanov calls for a vote on excluding article 139. The deputies vote: for 1,775; against 59; abstained 43. Article 139 is excluded. During the voting, Lukyanov reads out notices.

The afternoon session ends at 1647 GMT.

1650 GMT

LD1912175189

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1650 GMT on 19 December begins its recorded relay of the evening session of the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow, with Lukyanov in the chair.

Lukyanov reminds deputies that they must not vote for themselves and for absent colleagues at the same time. The next topic is the final wording of Articles 95 and 96. Article 95 concerns the election of deputies to represent public organizations. Lukyanov sums up the debate on the article so far. The supreme soviets of Kazakhstan and Belorussia have already taken decisions on this article. The drafting commission has proposed a further point to replace wording read out by Lukyanov. Deputy Samarin wishes to speak. Lukyanov tells him to sit down. There is said to be a conflict between parts 1 and 2. Lukyanov calls for order so that business can proceed. He goes on to say that, in fact, legal advice has shown that there is no conflict here relating to the election of deputies from public organizations. He refers to what was decided at yesterday's session. He puts the commission's recommendation to the vote. The deputies vote: for 1078; against 810; abstained 44. the recommendation is not adopted.

At 1707 GMT, Lukyanov says the recommendation will be referred back to the commission. He urges deputies to take their suggestions to the commission directly.

At 1710 Lukyanov moves on to Article 96, of which there are two versions before the deputies, concerning the eligibility of various categories of people for election as deputies representing public organizations. After reading out the wording of the existing article in the present constitution, Lukyanov reads out a suggested revised version of parts 1 and 2 of Article 96. He puts the suggested amendment to the vote. The deputies vote: for 1872; against 59; abstained 25. The amendment is carried.

At 1716 Lukyanov moves on to the next point, concerning the restriction on deputies' membership of more than one soviet. Should the existing restriction be maintained? He puts the question to the vote. The deputies vote: For 439; against 1466; abstained 40. The restriction should be abolished.

At 1721 Lukyanov puts another amendment, concerning restrictions on the right of members of the apparatus to be elected as deputies, to the vote. The deputies vote: for 497; against 1394; abstained 57. The amendment is defeated.

At 1725 Lukyanov goes on to introduce the next amendment to Article 96 concerning persons deprived of the right to vote. To this category belong persons suffering from mental illness and persons under detention. He reads out two versions of the relevant wording and calls for a vote on the second version. The deputies vote: for 1631; against 276; abstained 52.

At 1731 Lukyanov calls for a vote on removing the word "also" in the second version. The deputies vote: for 1796; against 100; abstained 40. The word "also" is deleted.

1731 GMT

LD1912184489

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1731 GMT on 19 December continues its recorded relay of the evening session of the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow.

At 1735 GMT, Deputy Reshetova, an experienced lawyer, advises the deputies on legal aspects of the question of eligibility to vote.

At 1737 Lukyanov moves on to another amendment to Article 96, proposed by Deputy Alksnis and referred by the drafting commission back to the congress. The amendment relates to the illegality of any restrictions imposed on the right to vote. It is to be referred back to the commission.

At 1743 Lukyanov calls for a vote on abolishing the mentioning in the constitution of the 750 deputies representing public organizations. The deputies vote: For 870; against 978; abstained 81. The article remains as currently expressed.

At 1745 a deputy speaks on Article 95. Lukyanov says that the article will be discussed again, so that the points made by the deputy would be best considered then.

At 1747 Lukyanov says that the discussion of changes to articles is at an end. Some deputies object. Lukyanov refers them to the commission.

At 1749, Lukyanov moves on to the wording of a decision on deputies' right to give effect to major laws, namely the laws on land, the socialist enterprise, etc, referring to the text in the deputies' possession and mentioning amendments suggested by Deputy Burlatskiy.

At 1754 a deputy speaks about the possible conflict that might arise if the supreme soviet is given the right to override congress decisions on legislation.

At 1756 Deputy Kozin discusses legislation on public organization representation.

At 1758 Lukyanov proposes ending the debate. The deputies vote: For 1,563; against 337; abstained 38.

At 1801 Lukyanov reads out some minor amendments suggested by the editorial commission.

At 1804 (Petrushenko) asks about possible conflicts in legislation.

At 1805 another deputy raises a similar point.

At 1806 Deputy Landsbergis from Lithuania questions possible actions by the Supreme Soviet which might infringe on the union republics.

At 1808 Deputy Kogan says that the congress's functions should not be handed over to the supreme soviet.

At 1809 Deputy Kozyrev points out contradictions in the constitution with regard to the functions of the congress and the supreme soviet.

At 1811 a deputy says that decisions should be taken by the congress.

At 1812 Deputy Akhromeyev opposes Lansbergis's support for union republics' sovereignty.

At 1813 Deputy Burbulis says that the supreme soviet should consider the new laws and then convene a congress.

At 1814 Deputy (Milyukin) speaks briefly on the subject.

At 1815 Deputy Ryabchenko calls for opinion polls on the new laws and says the public will could then be implemented by the supreme soviet. The laws must be implemented quickly, he says.

At 1817 Deputy Stepanov says that the congress elected the supreme soviet and should trust it more.

At 1818 Deputy Smirnov proposes a wording for the supreme soviet to discuss changes in legislation.

At 1819 a deputy speaks briefly on the subject.

At 1820 Deputy Pavlov quotes the constitution on exclusive rights of the congress.

At 1822 Deputy Lubenchenko says that in the present time of change, contradictions are inevitable. He calls for support for the editorial commission's proposals to speed up legislation.

At 1823 Deputy Nazarbayev, member of the editorial commission, gives the time-table for the proposed legislation and calls for support.

1823 GMT

LD1912193289

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1823 GMT on 19 December continues its recorded relay of the evening session of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow.

At 1824 GMT, Gorbachev says this is a vitally important question. He says that a way must be found to speed up the introduction of the new laws. If we adopt government program but not the suggested proposals, the position will not improve. Distrust must be overcome. The Supreme Soviet must be able to facilitate reform.

All conditions must be created to promote perestroyka, Gorbachev says. Delineation of rights between republics and the union must be pursued. Elections are already being held under the new rules. It is not always possible for the Supreme Soviet to wait for the congress to express its opinion. Life demands immediate reaction to events, he says.

At 1832 GMT, Lukyanov puts the matter to the vote. The deputies vote; 1742 for; 180 against; 53 abstained.

At 1835 GMT, Lukyanov announces an intermission.

At 1836 GMT, Lukyanov resumes the session with various announcements about documentation and misuse of voting cards.

At 1838 GMT, Lukyanov says there is 40 minutes for any other business.

At 1839 GMT, Deputy Gorlov complains that Deputy Zaslavskiy yesterday defamed deputies from public organizations. He names some wonderful people who are deputies from public organizations.

At 1842 GMT, Deputy Popov brings up the subject of mental health. Psychiatry in the USSR still has a bad name, but measures are being taken to improve it. New legislation is needed in this sphere. Some people are still defined as mentally ill for having in the past expressed opinions similar to those which can be heard in this hall. They must be rehabilitated, he says.

At 1847 GMT, Lukyanov says that the matter will be referred to a commission.

At 1848 GMT, a deputy talks about invalids' rights which are enshrined in the Constitution.

At 1853 GMT, Deputy Surkov complains about insults by the poet Yevtushenko.

At 1858 GMT, another deputy attempts to clarify his views on veterans, following suggestions that he had called them mafiosi.

At 1858 GMT, Gorbachev makes a procedural point from the presidium, asking deputies to behave themselves. Another deputy comes to the rostrum, to raise the problem of the shrinkage of the Aral Sea. He demands that the congress set up a special commission to sort out the problem. The government should treat residents of the Arab region as victims of a shipwreck, he says.

At 1902 GMT, Deputy Petrushenko complains about the disrespectful treatment of Soviet monuments in Poland and the Baltic republics and calls on the congress to take measures to show its commitment to such monuments.

At 1907 GMT, Lukyanov proposes setting up an editorial commission to study Petrushenko's proposals.

At 1908 GMT, the floor given to Deputy Sinelnikov from Voroshilovgrad Oblast, who complains about the lack of attention paid by procuracy and other state bodies to questions sent to them by deputies. He raises the cases of two forgotten war heroes who deserve recognition.

At 1913 GMT, Deputy Grigoryev takes the floor, describing perestroyka in the party as an essential part of the overall renewal of society, while defending party committees throughout the country against accusations made by some deputies concerning their role. He praises the government for its intellectual standards.

At 1918 GMT, Deputy Zaslavskaya takes exception to remarks by one deputy, who cast doubt on the legitimacy of her election to the congress. Rumors concerning her are a slander. She calls on the presidium to tackle the issue and urges the establishment of an ethics committee.

At 1920 GMT, Lukyanov declares the session closed until 0700 GMT tomorrow. The relay ends at 1920 GMT.

19 Dec Congressional Speeches Reported

Slyunkov Address

LD1912180189 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1305 GMT 19 Dec 89

[Remarks by Nikolay Nikitovich Slyunkov, Politburo member and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee

Secretariat, from the relay of the morning session of the USSR Congress of People's Deputies in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow on 19 December—recorded]

[Text] Comrade people's deputies! The government's report at the congress on measures to improve the economy, on stages of economic reform and approaches in principle to working out the 13th 5-year plan, and the discussion that is under way on these problems, have attracted the whole country's attention. In the report and in the speeches by people's deputies not only has a critical analysis of the present economic situation been given, but many constructive proposals have also been put forward, the implementation of which will make it possible to work out a clear and concrete program of actions.

Discussion of all sections of the report took place in a democratic fashion, in conditions of broad glasnost with the juxtaposition of various points of view, opinions, and approaches. The people's deputies spoke out in favor of decisive measures to improve the consumer market on the basis of increasing production of consumer goods, of sharply reducing state expenditure, overcoming the budget deficit, and a strict regime of economy in all spheres of the national economy. One hundred and sixty two deputies spoke during discussion of measures that had been put forward by the government, including 50 at plenary sessions. More than 300 deputies who were not able to speak at the congress gave their proposals to the editorial commission. In their notes, a number of deputies requested appraisals of every proposal that had come in, but this is impossible since 1,218 proposals and remarks were put forward in the speeches alone. The editorial commission considered all of them.

One-third of the proposals relate to the problems of deepening the economic reform, to the stages of that reform and to creating a legal basis for it. More than one-third of the proposals relate to matters of solving the food problem, replenishing the consumer market, financial improvements, normalizing currency circulation, raising the level of meeting the population's spiritual and cultural demands, and developing science, education, and health care. A great many principled proposals were put forward on solving the problem of accelerating scientific and technical progress, improving structural investment policy, developing the agro-industrial complex and on improving the ecological situation and making use of resources. Overall, the program presented reflects the well thought-out nature of the approaches in the period of implementing the measures.

In discussing the government program, a majority of deputies gave their backing to the proposed measures for improving the economy as well as for the further development of economic reform and the principle approaches to working out the 5-year plan. At the same time there were comments from individual deputies to the effect that the measures mapped out are insufficient. There were proposals to have them expanded and the time scale for their implementation made more precise. The editorial commission moves a proposal to support the measures worked out by the government. Through the joint efforts of the USSR people's deputies, the congress, and the government, a program is being created that permits economic maneuvering to bring the national economy gradually out of its critical state and to confer upon it the dynamism of development.

Almost 200 remarks and proposals came into the commission on the preliminary draft decision we received on Saturday 16 December, both individual personal ones from people's deputies and collective ones. Many deputies proposed that the draft decision be made more compact, systematic, brief but capacious, that the draft should reflect an analysis of the up-to-date state of our economy and urgent measures to improve it, deepening and accelerating economic reform and principle approaches to working out the plan for the 13th 5-year plan period. The commission agreed with such an approach.

Many deputies put forward the proposal to speed up the adoption by the USSR Supreme Soviet of main legislative acts creating a legal base for the functioning of the economy on the principles of economic reform. In connection with this the commission puts forward the proposal to instruct the Supreme Soviet to consider at a regular session such important laws as the law on property, on land, on enterprise, on the tax system, on local self-management, and on the general principles of the leadership of the economy and social sphere of union and autonomous republics.

In accordance with the numerous proposals made by deputies and with the aim of speeding up economic reform, the following instructions are included in the draft decision: on the working out next year by the USSR Council of Ministers in the banking system laws on the bank, on investment activity, on work and employment, and other legislative acts essential for speeding up economic reform and scientific and technical progress. It is of principal importance, in the view of the editorial commission, to instruct the USSR Council of Ministers to adopt a decision ensuring the fast introduction and practical implementation of new laws, to effect measures to work out the plan for the next 5-year plan period and to perfect training of cadres for work in new conditions.

You have the additionally worked draft decision of the congress. It envisions instructions to the USSR Supreme Soviet and the government that, in the view of the editorial commission, are aimed not only at overcoming present difficulties in the national economy, but also open up the prospect for the long-term economic development of the country on the basis of the new economic mechanism. The commission asks the people's deputies to support the draft decision of the new congress.

Admiral Chernavin

LD1912204789 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 19 Dec 89

[Remarks by Fleet Admiral Vladimir Nikolayevich Chernavin, commander in chief of the Navy, from the relay of the morning session of the USSR Second Congress of People's Deputies in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow on 19 December—recorded]

[Text] Esteemed comrade deputies. I want to express my attitude to one of the proposals made from this rostrum during discussion of the congress's main question, the report by Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov. Deputy Arbatov put forward a proposal not to approve and not to vote for the program put forward by the Council of Ministers on improving our economy. I will permit myself not to agree with this position since I think that it is dictated by an evident fear of taking on even the smallest responsibility for both our work at the congress and the state of affairs in the country.

It goes without saying that this is a position of not answering for anything, of not proposing anything, of subjecting everything to criticism, and in this way emphasizing one's significance and activity in perhaps an attractive and comfortable way. But is it a correct position? I think that the people expect from us not a departure from responsibility, but rather the contrary, responsibility, responsibility, and once again responsibility at this difficult time for our country. Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov put his signature on the document and as he said in his conclusion he does not intend to hide behind the deputies' backs. Evidently it is also unfitting for us, as people's deputies, to hide behind the government's back, the more so since nobody has submitted another program to our congress.

I propose that the request of Comrade Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov be supported and the proposal put forward by the Council of Ministers be approved; voting, in connection with the special significance of the question, should be carried out by name. I think that during voting there will be here both votes for and against, but obviously, comrade deputies, there should be no abstentions among you. Not on this occasion. To all intents and purposes we are talking about pronouncing a vote of confidence in the government we elected, headed by Comrade Ryzhkov, and I think that there are no grounds today for not trusting in this government. Thank you. [applause]

Lukyanov on Article 95 Amendment

LD1912164789

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1330 GMT on 19 December carries a report by Olga Vasilyenko from the correspondents' station at the Second Congress of People's Deputies. She notes that the evening session began 30 minutes ago, continuing with a discussion of amendments to the draft law on supplements and amendments to the USSR Constitution concerning the electoral system. She says that this morning, the editorial commission for summarizing proposals was at work, and during the break, deputies received a document in which the commission sought to take account of all these proposals. She adds that in opening the evening session, Anatoliy Ivanovich Lukyanov said the commission had looked for options to resolve the corrections to the second part of Article 95 in order to free the hands of the republics and to ensure that deputies elected from public organizations might consider themselves fully fledged deputies. He recalled that the Supreme Soviet recommended that Congress remove from this article the words concerning elections from public organizations, but a great many proposals had been expressed at the Congress both in favor of leaving such a form of elections and against it. And after all, the Supreme Soviets of Kazakhstan and Belorussia have already adopted such legislation on elections in their republics, making it possible to elect people's deputies from public organizations.

Vasilyenko continues, as Anatoliy Ivanovich Lukyanov said: "After a lengthy discussion, and taking account of all comments, the editorial commission has resolved to propose a version of the second part of the article, taking account of proposals by deputies who expressed a view, and, at the same time, in order to place, as it were, a barrier to the possibility of an election in the future from public organizations of deputies to the highest body of power in the Union. They propose in the decision which will be adopted—there are now two points there, as you have seen, at the end—they are proposing the adoption of a third point comprising the following. So, I am reading what the editorial commission has proposed. Instead of all those words which I read out to you from the effective Constitution, the following paragraph is to be included: A portion of the USSR People's Deputies, and likewise, if this is envisaged by the constitutions of the republics, a portion of the people's deputies of the Union and autonomous republics, may be elected from public organizations.

"At the same time, it is proposed to write the following third point into the decision of the Congress: The Constitutional Commission, taking account of the accumulted experience and proposals of the USSR people's deputies is, in good time, to prepare and present to the Supreme Soviet, and the Congress is to adopt before the next elections of the USSR people's deputies, a new law on elections of USSR people's deputies and the amendments to the USSR Constitution necessary for its implementation."

Vasilyenko concludes that this proposal was put to the vote, but did not get more than the required two-thirds of the votes needed for constitutional amendments. As such, the proposal failed. The matter was again referred to the commission, and Lukyanov asked deputies with various corrections or amendments relating to this article of the Constitution to pass them to the editoral commission. Deputies then went on to discuss corrections to Article 96, Vasilyenko notes.

Lithuania's Landsbergis

LD1912234189 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1806 GMT 19 Dec 89

[Remarks by Lithuanian Deputy Vitautas Vitautovich Landsbergis, from the relay of the evening session of the USSR Second Congress of People's Deputies in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow on 19 December—recorded]

[Text] Esteemed chairman, esteemed deputies, with regard to the first point of the proposed decision, it contains quite a considerable section about delineating the powers between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Union republics. It is proposed to give jurisdiction over this to the Supreme Soviet, permitting it to adopt laws and permitting it to make changes in the Constitution at least until the next congress. But the congress can be convened no less frequently than once per week. That means that the Supreme Soviet can encroach upon the sovereign rights of the republics without the possibility of a reaction or self-defense right up to, of course, the most extreme decisions in the republics. I propose that everyone who cherishes the principles of the state sovereignty of the republics should come out against the adoption of the decision in this form—the first point; I have no objection to the second point, but against the first point, or so that the delineation of powers between the Union of SSR's and the Union republics should be removed. Let everyone decide what he is to do, to vote against or not to particpate. Thank you.

Gorbachev Remarks

LD2012000289 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1824 GMT 19 Dec 89

[Remarks by M.S. Gorbachev, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, from the relay of the evening session of the USSR Second Congress of People's Deputies in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow on 19 December—recorded]

[Text] This a question of extreme importance. I would like to take you back to the start of the congress. At that time, we made the decision not to include on the agenda the discussion of questions that have been brought up now in these points of the decision which is being proposed to you. And the thing was precisely that at the congress, we are unable to introduce these fundamental laws which are very necessary to us for perestroyka and very important, laws which will determine both the rate and the direction of perestroyka. But we cannot introduce them without having discussed them or consulted with the people on these fundamental questions of our life today and, especially, our life in the future.

At that time, there was a heated squabble about it. Nonetheless, we recognized that they should not be included on the agenda. But, at the same time, and, I, in particular, did this, I cited many arguments that we should without fail find ways and means so that these laws should be prepared and discussed and adopted more rapidly so that they should not only not hold back but, on the contrary should facilitate our perestroyka.

I think that you will agree that this is the way things were. At that time, we adopted a decision on the agenda that we are following, and left these questions outside the agenda. I stress that at the time, too, we all recognized the necessity that these fundamental matters which underpin our perestroyka and the way it will proceed further—we all recognized this unanimously, this was the overall opinion—should be speeded up after the congress.

I think that it is worth recalling again that it was precisely on these points, generally speaking, that differences could be felt among us during the discussion of the government's program because if we adopt the government's program but do not tackle all of these questions, then, I must say that among that group of deputies who very fiercely demonstrated the point of view that they have suspicions of attempts to stop and bring down perestroyka, to return once again to command and administrative methods, then these moods would get stronger. I think that it is possible that such a situation will be created.

In order to remove these concerns, in order for us to understand each other better and for us really to unite all of our efforts, I wanted to say something, perhaps somewhere at the close about this, but the present moment requires it now because we are about to adopt a decision—that precisely what we need is the government program which we supported, in combination with subsequent, intensive work in the Supreme Soviet to create these laws which will open up the path for reform in all directions.

Therefore, we must find a way out, a way to resolve this. That is, we must surely come as the commission proposes; there may be different words, these can be sought further, some sort of more precisely specified formulae, but the essence, apparently, should come down to this, that we complete the nation-wide discussion on the draft laws which is now under way, that work intensively in committees and commissions of the Supreme Soviet and in the Supreme Soviet, itself, in its chambers and at general sessions, and do everything to ensure that in February we really get around to adopting these fundamental laws without which we shall not be able to conduct a successful perestroyka. That is absolutely clear. And when we have supported the government's program and adopted this decision, then, and the discussion should not be restricted to this, then, we are united in the understanding that we, on the one hand, are undertaking measures that should improve the situation, reduce social and economic tension. It is essential to do this and I think that no one will speak against that here. It is necessary to do this but at the same time, we are fundamentally doing everything so as to move perestroyka forward, to create all the economic and legal prerequisites for this, including this question which has been especially singled out here, the delineation of the competences of the union and the republics.

It is needed, it is needed. Of course, it will not be solved if we do not examine the issues of economic independence, although the general provisions of the latter have not yet received approval by the Supreme Soviet, even in the first reading. Yes, this is so but this is a process. Therefore, by this decision, we are opening a path for an intensive process aimed at completing the work that has been started within the framework of the Supreme Soviet.

And now, how should we act? It is precisely in relation with this that the issue of precedent was raised. We are adopting today, and have not adopted yet or introduced all the changes in the election system, in the Constitution, its chapter 13 which touches upon the election system. But we have already conducted elections in several republics because then we deemed it necessary, on the basis of the adopted law and the decisions of the Supreme Soviet, to give the republics a possibility to carry out this work. In this case, one has in mind not a precedent in general, as such, for any issue, but strictly in accordance with the list of laws which we need and without which there will be no advance in perestroyka. We have named them. It is precisely in accordance with this list that one should act in such a way that there should be a possibility after the Supreme Soviet to unfold all these processes, both at the top and below, but at the same time, naturally, the last word belongs to the congress. I would rather not formulate the question this way now. We shall wait for a year for that congress to be held. Maybe the situation will take...[Gorbachev changes thought] When we discuss the issues of ownership and land, it may be required, you know, to convene a congress immediately after the Supreme Soviet. Life will tell, life will tell. One should simply register the possibility of this progress, in principle, but the last word belongs to the congress. We will eventually determine the formula for this. Society will sense this, comrades. But indeed, one cannot not squeeze this rapidly changing life, with its enormous and profound changes, in some shape or pattern and live accordingly. We have to search, and I think that the congress must open a way for these processes by acting in the suggested manner. I do not vouch for particulars, perhaps some amplifications should be made, but I think we must adopt such a document without fail. Then the government's program which has been supported and this decision on accelerating the adoption of fundamental laws, when adopted, will instill us all with confidence, and we are uniting with the goal of advancing all the processes of perestroyka.

TASS Summarizes 19 Dec Congress Activities

LD1912204989 Moscow TASS in English 2010 GMT 19 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 19 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

The Second Congress of People's Deputies today backed the government's programme on stabilsing the economy, stages of economic reform and the governmental concept of elaborating a plan of the country's economic development in 1991-1995.

The programme has been discussed in great detail for four days. It had its advocates and opponents, criticisms came both from the "right" and "left."

The former asserted that the government is giving in to economists who favour the unconditional freedom of the market.

The latter accused the government of insufficient courage in conducting reforms.

A number of speakers insisted during the debates that the congress should make a note of the government programme rather than approve it.

Many deputies, however, regarded that as an attempt to shun responsibility for the implementation of the programme and did not support this motion.

During the vote, 1,532 deputies backed the programme, 419 voted against and 44 abstained.

The proposal to express mistrust in the government "for the elaboration of an unsatisfactory programme", moved by Yuriy Andreyev, a Moscow engineer, was rejected by the majority of 1,685 against 199. There were 98 abstentions.

The congress endorsed amendments to the constitutional articles defining procedures of elections to republican parliaments and local bodies of government.

The greatest controversy was over the issue whether to retain the existing constitutional principle allocating a fixed number of seats to public organisations.

Yesterday, the deputies failed to find an acceptable wording. The new wording, suggested today, did not collect the required number of votes, and the work on this article will be continued. All the other amendments were accepted.

The congress adopted a resolution assigning the Supreme Soviet, or Parliament, to speed up the adoption of laws on ownership and on land and several other major bills.

It was decided to put them into effect before approving amendments to the Constitution stemming from these laws by the next, Third Congress of People's Deputies.

Anatoliy Lukyanov, who chaired the afternoon session, informed the deputies that on the day following the conclusion of the congress the Supreme Soviet presidium plans to have a meeting to discuss the situation inside and around Nagorno-Karabakh.

The congress will continues its work tomorrow.

Deputies Address Congress on 'Special' Issues

LD1912201689 Moscow TASS in English 1936 GMT 19 Dec 89

[Text] The Second Congress of People's Deputies today resumed practices tried at the first congress: deputies were given one hour to speak on special-interest issues that did not enter the official agenda.

Ten deputies took the floor.

Nikolay Petrushenko, a military officer, sharply denounced the recent facts of the defilement of Soviet state symbols inside the country, the desecration of communal graves of Soviet soldiers in Poland and the dismantling of a monument to Vladimir I. Lenin in the city of Nowa Huta.

The deputy proposed that the congress express its attitude to these actions in a special resolution.

Vladimir Grigoyev, a party official from Belorussia, rejected the accusations of acting against perestroyka that are sometimes levelled against party committees.

He favoured the consolidation of progressive forces in society and stated that the party is open for constructive cooperation with all forces operating on a truly humane and socialist basis.

Many deputies today spoke about various problems that beset regions or organisations they represent.

Tulepbergen Kaypbergenov, a writer from central Asia, rose the question about the miserable ecological situation in the Aral Sea region.

Speakers discussed the culture of debates and made remarks about some excessively "fiery" statements.

Deputies Vote on Constitutional Amendments

LD1912183489 Moscow TASS in English 1724 GMT 19 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 19 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

USSR People's Deputies today continued voting on amendments to constitutional articles concerning elections to republican and local governing bodies.

The amendments were discussed on Monday [18 December] and some of them were adopted. At the same time, heated debates prevented deputies from considering all the changes.

A stumbling block was the provision of the election of People's Deputies from public organisations (under the USSR Constitution, one third of parliamentary seats belong to public organisations).

Opponents of this provision consider such elections nondemocratic, they violate the principle: One voter-one voice. In contrast, supporters see it as a guarantee of the representation of interests of invalids, war veterans, and other vulnerable groups of the population.

On Monday both parties failed to win the majority of votes. Today's voting of the article's new edition was inconclusive as well.

It was decided that the editorial commission should reconsider the variants proposed by deputies and submit them to the Congress at future meetings.

Amendments to articles that determine the composition of election commissions and voters' rights to discuss candidates and some others were adopted without major differences.

Thus, all amendments with the exception of the one on elections from public organisations were approved by the Congress with some specifications.

Bill Adopted on Instructions to Parliament

LD1912203989 Moscow TASS in English 2018 GMT 19 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 19 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

After endorsing amendments to the Soviet Constitution on elections to republican and local bodies of government, the Second Congress of People's Deputies today started deliberating a congressional bill on instructions to the USSR Supreme Soviet.

The bill provides for the faster adoption of laws on ownership, on land, on the socialist enterprise, on the taxation system, on general principles of managing the economy and the social sphere in union and autonomous republics, on the delineation of powers between the union as a whole and the constituent republics, and on general principles of local self-government and local economy.

The draft resolution states that it is possible to put into effect these laws before considering changes to the constitution at the next Congress of People's Deputies.

The latter wording generated both ardent support and strong criticism. Its advocates regard it as a means to speed up the introduction of legal mechanisms in order to fulfill the government programme of stabilising the economy and to encourage economic reform.

Its opponents assessed it as an attempt to belittle the role of the congress.

President Mikhail Gorbachev joined the debate. He stressed that these are fundamental laws that will determine both the pace and the direction of perestroika.

At the start of the congress, the items related to these laws were not placed on the agenda. "They could not have been placed on the agenda without first consulting the people," Gorbachev remarked.

"If we adopt the government's programme but do not resolve all these questions," he pointed out, "some deputies may develop suspicions that the centre wants to reintroduce administer-by- command methods."

"The government's programme that we have supported, combined with the subsequent intensive work at the Supreme Soviet on developing laws that will pave the way for reform in all directions—this is what we need," Gorbachev emphasised. He suggested doing everything so that active work could be started at the session of the Supreme Soviet and at its houses, committees and commissions after nationwide debates and the fundamental laws be ready for adoption in February.

Without these laws, it is impossible to proceed with perestroika, he added.

Given this approach, Gorbachev remarked, there will be an opportunity, after the Supreme Soviet adopts decisions, to start practical work both at higher and lower levels. Naturally, the last word will be with the congress.

As to the third congress, Gorbachev said, life will show when it will be best to convene it.

The overwhelming majority of deputies—1,742—voted for this resolution.

Ryzhkov Interviewed After Approval of Program

LD1912174789 Moscow World Service in English 1510 GMT 19 Dec 89

[Interview With USSR Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov by correspondent V. Terekhov in the Moscow Kremlin on 19 December—recorded]

[Excerpts] On Tuesday [19 December] the Second Congress of People's Deputies approved the government program for improving the economic situation—1,532 deputies backed the program, while 419 voted against. After the voting Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov granted an interview to Vyacheslav Terekhov for Radio Moscow listeners abroad.

[Begin recording] [Terekhov] It was hard to reach the head of Government during the first interval after the approval of the government program. Hundreds of MPs congratulated him on the vote of confidence. Did the prime minister himself expect the support of 1,500 people? Such was the first question to the head of government on behalf of foreign listeners.

[Ryzhkov in Russian fading into English translation] To my mind, the discussion of the issue was very complicated and I would even say heated and tense. These were hard days for the Government. We realized that it was a question whether the program is the one necessary for the country or it is not the road along which the economy should be developed and the country should take. Naturally, we were not indifferent to the course of discussion but we have confidence in our program.

[Terekhov] During the debate some speakers sharply criticized the Government. What was your reaction?

[Ryzhkov] Ever since the approval of the Cabinet half a year ago, all members of the Government had worked on the program day and night, and the impolite sharp attacks on the Government that were sometimes made were offensive to us, of course, but I think this will pass with time. The fact that over 1,500 deputies backed the government program means that there is trust in the Government. I appreciate it very much. The days of discussion were not easy, of course, I took it close to heart. But I'm still convinced that there is no third road—either the Government should carry out the program together with the people or it should have resigned and someone else would have to outline a new program. The program passed on Wednesday is extremely complicated. We will have to work hard to carry it out.

[Terekhov] What will be the first steps of your Government?

[Ryzhkov] As soon as the Congress ends the whole Cabinet will have to get together and work out a very clear cut plan of action.

[Terekhov] The government program could not be concrete?

[Ryzhkov] I still think so, especialy as far as concrete figures for the future are concerned. Our program provided the guideline for the economy. After the Congress we'll discuss how to reach these objectives and what concrete steps should be taken. I'm convinced that if we had said nothing in general about the future 5-year plan, especially its social part, the public would have been disappointed. People would be asking themselves: what are we in for? What are the objectives of the next 5-year period? I disagree with some of the speakers, especially members of the interregional group of MPs who say there should be no talks of future. In practice this would mean developing according to the principle [of] go wherever the wind blows. [end recoding] [passage omitted]

Maslyukov, Dzasokhov Give News Conference 19 Dec

PM2012120989 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 20 Dec 89 Second Edition p 2

[Unnamed TASS correspondent report: "Way to a Healthy Economy"]

[Text] The Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies supported the government's proposed measures for economic recovery contained in N.I. Ryzhkov's report. A 19 December news conference in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses was devoted to the results of the deputies' discussion of the government program. Yu.D. Maslyukov, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and A.S. Dzasokhov, acting chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet International Affairs Committee, took part in it.

No alternative—or anything close to it—was submitted to our comprehensive program, Yu.D. Maslyukov pointed out. I would even say that no major changes in the program for economic recovery were proposed. On the whole deputies' speeches voiced concern as to how effective and really able to improve the economic situation the government measures will prove to be. We are very grateful to those deputies who approached the discussion of the program in a constructive fashion, considerably enriching and supplementing it with many proposals. The government will, of course, examine and consider these wishes when putting the final finishing touches to the document.

The exacting debate which unfolded at the congress over the foreign economic aspects of the government program, A.S. Dzasokhov said, convincingly demonstrated the pressing need for the restructuring of our country's foreign economic activity. He pointed out that the level and structure of the latter do not accord with the USSR's position in the international community and its production and scientific and technical capabilities.

Maslyukov Hails Ryzhkov Program

LD1912205989 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 19 Dec 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast; V. Stepanyuk report on 19 November Kremlin news conference]

[Text] [Stepanyuk] This news conference—news conferences have become a tradition here in the Palace of Congresses—was awaited by the journalists with particular impatience. That is understandable, for it was precisely today that one of the main issues on the agenda was resolved. The government's economic program has been approved. The news conference was conducted by Comrade Maslyukov. In his introductory speech he said:

[Begin Maslyukov recording] We attribute very great significance to those instructions of the congress that have been given to the Supreme Soviet and the government in the sphere of working out a legal basis for future economic reform and in general for all our activity. This legal basis should be adopted in the very first months. Otherwise, all our proposals are deprived of the foundation on which it could be built.

The last thing I would like to say in my introductory speech is that we attribute very great significance to the program for the fulfillment of the plan for 1990, because that year is the start of radical perestroyka. It is the start of the financial recovery, it is the start of the recovery of the market, and we think that, having applied every effort above all to the organization and fulfillment of the plan for 1990, we will be doing precisely what is expected of us today. Today, every toiler, every enterprise, every republic, and all of the government should be aware of their responsibility and the importance of carrying out the measures that have been planned. [end recording]

[Stepanyuk] Comrade Maslyukov answered many questions asked by correspondents that touch upon the widest possible range of aspects of the governmental program. What was probably the most precise and topical question seemed to us to be the following.

[Begin recording] [Unidentified correspondent] From the Vremya program. Yuriy Dmitriyevich, be so kind as to answer: What will be the very first specific steps that the government will take to implement the governmental program that has been currently adopted at the congress?

[Maslyukov] We will make a careful analysis of everything that has been said by the deputies. Everywhere there is anguish and a desire to correct the state of affairs in each specific sphere on which the speeches at the congress were heard. That is the first thing. The second thing is that we consider that we must take all the necessary measures right away to ensure the fulfillment of the plan for the production of consumer goods. I will remind you that our increase is R66 billion. Never before have we been able to boost growth by more than R17 billion. That is, the annual target has been quadrupled. To do this, we will have to remove all obstacles in the path of fulfilling the plan. We must provide for unconditional provision—provide for provision does not sound very good—but in any case the material and technical resources should first and foremost be given over precisely to the fulfillment of this program. This is the most important sphere. [video shows Maslyukov and others at news conference] [end recording]

Cites U.S. Disappointment

LD1912175789 Moscow TASS in English 1505 GMT 19 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 19 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

Yuriy Maslyukov, first deputy prime minister of the USSR, expressed bewilderment about recent Washington reports that some U.S. officials are "disappointed" by the preservation of a planned economy in the USSR.

Maslyukov addressed journalists accredited to the Second Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR at a press conference in the Kremlin today.

Asked by TASS to comment on statements by some U.S. officials that U.S. intentions to support granting the Soviet Union observer status in international economic organisations, expressed at the Malta meeting, would possibly be reconsidered, Yuriy Maslyukov said: "It is quite possible that some American observers are disappointed by what they consider conservative deliberations at the current congress, particularly on the government's role in economy. But it would be wrong for the USSR to give up state planning out of hand and plunge headlong into the stormy waters of a market economy."

Maslyukov denied rumours that the Soviet Communist Party Politburo pressured the government during the elaboration of the economic rivitalisation programme. "The Council of Ministers worked on it absolutely independently," he stressed.

Asked whether the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance would not be destabilised by a transfer to convertible currency and world prices in its commercial settlements, Maslyukov said: "This could happen if the present approaches are preserved. Soviet settlements in hard currency with such countries as Yugoslavia and China testify to the opposite".

Abalkin, Others Comment on Government Program

LD1912142689 Moscow TASS in English 1353 GMT 19 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 19 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondents:

Immediately after the second congress supported the government programme, TASS spoke to several people's deputies of the USSR.

"I supported the government proposals because they represent a correct approach to tackling complex problems of the Soviet economy," said Valentin Ogarok, deputy chairman of the Planning, Budget and Finance Commission of the Council of the Union. "No other sensible programme has been proposed to us."

Rafik Nishanov, chairman of the chamber of nationalities, said the resolution was based on a real assessment of the situation, a sensible compromise between the forces from both right and left.

Soviet Deputy Prime Minister Leonid Abalkin said the result of the vote marked "the victory of common sense and reason over emotions and attempts to destabilise the situation." The academician said the decision of the congress can be regarded as a vote of confidence in the Soviet Council of Ministers.

"Should our programme fail to receive support, we were ready to resign immediately. There was no wavering on this score," he said.

It is well known that far from all people's deputies supported the government proposals. For example, economist Nikolay Shmelev said he voted only for taking it into consideration. The scientist believes that the principles of the government programme are absolutely correct but the measures in it are insufficient, especially for the revitalisation of the current economic and financial situation.

Mikhail Bocharov, secretary of the Parliamentary Committee on Construction, who voted against the government programme, said it "lacked specific steps aimed at promoting reform."

Sergey Alekseyev, chairman of the Legislation Committee, called the government proposals the only real way to change over to the commodity-market economy.

"I have great trust in Nikolay Ryzhkov," the deputy said. "He is a dynamic leader, open to changes, but he will not permit ill-conceived steps."

Analyst Views Government Economic Program

LD2012092389 Moscow TASS in English 0742 GMT 20 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 20 TASS—By TASS analyst Andrey Orlov:

Prince Hamlet's "to be or not to be?" dilemma was solved in a positive way on Tuesday as the Congress of People's Deputies approved a government economic programme combining emergency measures and far-reaching economic reforms.

The congress gave a vote of confidence to the government plan after a grueling debate.

The debate is over and now comes the hard part—the implementation of the programme.

Winding up discussions Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov said successful implementation requires trust from all deputies and the entire society.

It is hard to say if the government will get what it wants: trust in the government is in short supply as Soviet people have grown tired of promises. It is this inability to make progress that prompted the Soviet Union to begin reforms in 1985 now known the world over as perestroika.

Ryzhkov's programme drew a varied response from people's deputies: from approval to complete rejection. Most deputies, however, backed the plan, voting it into law.

Regrettably, many of the country's economic elite opposed it, and the government will have to work hard to convince these economists and all society that administrative levers are necessary only at the initial stage to stabilise the volatile economic situation.

Without stabilisation "the rest of the measures will be just palliatives," Deputy Prime Minister Leonid Abalkin said.

Answering critics who say the programme aims to postpone reforms, the government likened an immediatte and unprepared switch to market economics to an attempt to walk out of a seventh floor apartment into the street through a window—theoretically possible but fraught with unpleasant consequences.

Anyway, the deputies expressed support for the government. It looks like this will be the last credit and it will have to be repaid. The government knows this, according to Prime Minister Ryzhkov, who said that if the programme fails other people will move in to prepare other programmes.

Political & Social

Lithuanian Party Congress Opens 19 Dec

LD2012005189 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 19 Dec 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast; report by correspondent V. Beketov]

[Text] The 20th Lithuanian Communist Party Congress opened in Vilnius today. [V. Beketov] We felt the breath and the atmosphere of the congress several hours before its opening and even outside the bounds of the theater of opera and ballet where the congress was beginning its work. Each of the deputies passed as it were through a line of pickets representing various public organizations and movements. [video shows area around congress building, pickets and delegates arriving]

On the first day, apart from a prolonged discussion of procedural matters—this is already becoming a tradition—the delegates listened to a report from Algirdas Brazauskas, first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee, [video shows Brazauskas speaking] The basic idea of this document is concentrated in its introductory section where the rapporteur replied to the question: Why has the need arisen to convene this congress? In the first place, the report says—this is the will of the majority of the communists of Lithuania born of the objective need for renewal, for distancing oneself from the tragic mistakes permitted by the party in the past. Second, it is an attempt to switch from a strictly centralized state role of the party to the status of a democratic political party. Third, it will be impossible to overcome the profound consequencs of the social and economic crisis if the party's subordinate status contradicts the idea of the republic's economic independence.

But what did its delegates bring to the congress? A few interviews in the wings of the congress. [video shows unidentified delegates being interviewed]

[First delegate] I think that the status of the Lithuanian Communist Party should be defined by the fact that the Lithuanian Communist Party, with its independent status should continue to remain within the CPSU.

[Interviewer] The main topic at the congress and in the report and debates is the independence of the Lithuanian Communist Party.

[Second delegate] I think that there is no alternative here. Each person, just like each people wants to be independent, just like every party.

[Beketov] Our report would be incomplete if we did not mention what persistent and massive pressure the congress is being subjected to from both from extreme right-wing and extreme left-wing forces. This, so to speak, is the setting in which the sitting of the party forum is taking place. One wanted to ask, why had these people come here? What do they want? [video shows street interview]

[Beketov] Introduce yourself please.

[Terlackas] Antanas Terlackas.

[Beketov] Right, and in what capacity have you come here?

[Terlackas] I am a member of the Council of the Lithuanian Freedom League. I want to convince people that before coming here to the ballot boxes, they should think. I have not been seeking to persuade them not to come. I am not seeking to persuade them of this, but they should think it over well. Lithuania will be economically free when it becomes...that is, politically free, when Lithuanian statehood is restored.

[Beketov] As we see it, the situation at the congress and around it is far from simple and unambiguous. But we won't draw premature conclusions. The congress has just begun, and tomorrow is the second day.

'Stormy' Congress Reported

LD1912194189 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1825 GMT 19 Dec 89

[Text] Vilnius, 19 Dec (TASS)—TASS special correspondents reports:

The stormy heatedness of political passions on the eve of the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of this Baltic republic has developed into an open battle for delegates' votes on the very first day of its work. In a declaration by the credential commission today a proposal was put forward on the deprivation of 43 delegates from the party organizations of military units stationed on the territory of Lithuania of their rights to participate in voting and on transferring them to the rank of guests.

The delegates from the military units were elected to the congress at contested elections in their own party organizations in accordance with valid instructions approved by the CPSU Central Committee. The motive of the credentials commission was that communists within the country's armed forces are registered with their own political bodies and are not members of the republic's party organization.

In fact, the credentials commission has come out against the decision of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee plenum, which confirmed the quota for the representation of delegates who are members of the military at the congress.

After a lively discussion in which party veterans, servicemen, and party officials took part, the proposal of the credentials commission was put to the vote. It was supported by only 139 delegates out of more than a thousand who were present at the congress.

A manifestly discriminatory act was not committed, but the problem that was spoken about today in his political report at the congress by Algirdas Brazauskas, the republic's party leader, remained. He recalled in particular that it was frequently being asserted in Lithuania that the Army should be withdrawn from the republic and replaced by national formations. In connection with this Algirdas Brazauskas stressed that "at the present time it is hard to imagine an uncentralized defense for the country." It is not possible, he said, "to resolve these issues in relation to one republic without having achieved changes in the union as a whole."

Vilnius Radio Carries 19 Dec Lithuanian Congress

0800 GMT

LD1912233189

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 0800 GMT on 19 December begins a live relay from the 20th Lithuanian Communist Party extraordinary congress being held in Vilnius.

The relay begins with a discussion of organizational questions at the congress. This is followed by the election of a tellers' commission and the working presidium of the congress. The session is presided over by Algirdas Brazauskas, first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee.

The congress Secretariat is then set up; the secretariat consists of 28 members.

At 0835 GMT, the agenda is discussed. The proposal is to listen to the report which will be followed by a discussion on the status of the Lithuanian Communist Party. When the discussion is completed—which may not be today—a vote will be taken.

Brazauskas proposes some amendments to the agenda: First, listen to a report by Baltrunas on the party's program, then Beriozovas would report on the state of the Lithuanian Communist Party and Zilevicius on the finances of an independent Lithuanian Communist Party. Other proposals are voiced, including one by Budriunas, to the effect that the main declaration on the party statute should be adopted immediately after the main report.

At 0900 GMT, the discussions on the agenda conclude. An open ballot is taken on each item of the agenda. The results of the voting are: on the first item—862 in favor of the proposed agenda, with 98 delegates voting against, and 15 abstentions.

The second item on the agenda—the party statute—is adopted.

The third item—the party program—is also adopted with 698 votes for having two reports by Baltrunas and Paleckis.

The fourth item is a report by the Auditing Commission, which is adopted without difficulty.

The fifth item is the program of actions by the Lithuanian Communist Party. Brazauskas proposes to include this item in the agenda, saying that the program has been discussed by members of the party and the general public. Several other proposals include a call for Sakalauskas, chairman of the Lithuanian Council of Ministers, to make a report. The proposal to discuss the party's action program is adopted by a majority of votes.

At 0930 GMT, the last item on the agenda, on the election of the Central Committee, is adopted. A vote is then taken on the entire agenda.

At 0945 GMT, when the proceedings on standing orders at the congress is concluded, Brazauskas says that the congress is expected to last for about 4 days. It is also decided that the entire work of the congress will be broadcast live on radio, with television video recordings being broadcast in the evenings.

A question is then raised concerning guests at the congress. Brazauskas says that no specific guests have been invited because the congress is the private affair of the Lithuanian Communist Party. Brazauskas adds that a guest from Moscow, Yevgeniy Nikolayevich Trofimov, head of the CPSU Central Committee section on party organization and cadre department, is present at the congress.

At 1009 GMT, the congress adjourns for an expected 30 minutes.

At 1025 GMT the relay is intercepted in progress, Brazauskas is delivering his report. During his report Brazauskas says: "The Communist Party of Lithuania was incorporated into the All-Union Communist Party with the rights of an oblast party organization. The republican party organization thus became a direct tool of the Stalinist regime and an addendum to the powerful state repressive apparatus. The republic's inhabitants were particularly painfully affected by the Stalinist deportations of innocent people to the northern parts of the country.

"Today we state here, in front of everybody, that the Communist Party of Lithuania is politically guilty of having been a component part of the Stalinist totalitarian system, and by implementing its will. We categorically dissociate ourselves from those persons who, hiding under the slogans of building a socialist society and having usurped the right to represent the interests of the people, have violated the requirements of legality and human moral norms."

Brazauskas goes on to speak about the Hitlerite invasion. He also says that Communists had to work in very difficult conditions under Stalin. He says: "The period of 1945-53 was one of the blackest and most tragic periods in Lithuanian history. We recall it not only to condemn crimes and honor the victims. We, the Lithuanian Communists of today, must ensure that this is never repeated. The establishment of a state based on law is the most reliable guarantee that this will not be repeated."

At 1128 GMT, reception deteriorated to unmonitorable. When reception is recovered, Brazauskas is heard speaking about the reasons for convening the congress, saying:

"The reasons for convening the congress were: First, as already pointed out, this was the will of the majority of Communists of Lithuania, which originated from the objective necessity for renewal, the necessity to dissociate from the tragic mistakes the party had committed in the past, and the Stalinist crimes. This means that we have to be guided by principle at this congress, while making an all-round assessment of the controversial events in the past.

"Second, this is an attempt to go over from the role of a strictly centralized state party to the status of a democratic political party. A whole complex of problems concerning the democratization of Lithuania is linked with this, the most important being the legalization of political pluralism, the start for which has already been made with the amendment of Article 6 of the Constitution.

"Third, it would not be possible to effectively overcome the results of deep economic and social crisis if the status of the party subordination ran counter to the concept of the republic's economic sovereignty.

"Fourth, it is necessary to consolidate the independence of the Lithuanian Communist Party to allow the party to take an appropriate and equal part in the first democratic elections during the postwar period to the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet, i.e. to win places by democratic means in the organs of legislation and the executive organs of administration.

"Fifth, it is necessary to renew the Central Committee."

Brazauskas continues his report to the congress:

"Almost 5 years ago, the belief in society had taken root that it was impossible to carry on living the way we had. Today, in the presence of all Lithuania, the objectives to which the party will be aspiring in its work should once again be named by the Communists of Lithuania.

"First, the all-round development of democracy. Only on the basis of democratic principles which have proved their vitality in the history of the civilized world can a modern society be set up.

"Second, there is the restoration of Lithuanian statehood. This is our strategic objective, which was voiced a couple of months ago in the statement made by the most famous scientists and workers or culture of this republic. Its aims at ensuring the existence of Lithuania as a sovereign state, a state with a long history of statehood to ensure the material and spiritual welfare of all the people of this republic; and to ensure social justice and the development of culture and arts.

"Third, the independent Communist Party of Lithuania. Only by having this would the Lithuanian Communist Party be able to express the interests of the people of Lithuania, to compete with other political forces on an equal footing. By having considerable intellectual and organizational possibilities, the party will help to take Lithuania out of political, social, and economic crisis, turn it into a democratic society, and guarantee the stability of this process.

"However, the statehood of the nation should not be expressed in absolute terms. Although it is an important means in the survival and normal existence of the nation, it is not the goal. The goal is a democratic society, social equality, and conditions in which the peoples' material and spiritual needs can be materialized to the maximum degree. What we call socialist democracy is not genuine democracy in the real meaning of this word.

"The Lithuanian Communist Party has voiced its position on this issue on more than one occasion: We are for a sovereign Lithuanian state. I would like to remind you here, that according to international law, sovereignty is political independence, and the independence of this state in pursuing its domestic and foreign policies."

At 1150 GMT, Brazauskas speaks about economic reform, saying specifically that inflation should be stabilizied and incentives for better work should be established. He says that Lithuania has retained a level in agriculture, from which the renaissance of agriculture can begin. All forms of ownership should be applied in agriculture, he adds.

Brazauskas stresses that only a strong economy can make the thinking of sovereignty a reality. Restoring the natural priorities of the Lithuanian nation on the historic land of Lithuanians does not mean that Lithuanian interests are opposed to the interests of other nationalities living in Lithuania, he says.

At 1200 GMT, Brazauskas speaks about the historic development of pluralist ideas and a pluralist political system in Lithuania. This was stopped by the authoritarian regime of President Antanas Smetona, he says, adding that today this system is returning.

Brazauskas ends his report at 1207 GMT.

Following several rearrangements in the composition of several commissions, the congress adjourns.

At 1400 GMT, the congress resumes with Justinas Marcinkevicius presiding.

J. Kubilius, rector of Vilnius University, takes the floor. During his speech, he repeats the slogan to the effect that Lithuania without sovereignty is a Lithuania without a future. He says this slogan has been adopted by all Lithuanians. However, the Lithuanian Communist

Party will be unable to ensure the materialization of the slogan until it is granted independence.

At 1410 GMT, Songayla, first secretary of the Mazeikiai Rayon Party Committee, takes the floor. He supports all the ideas voiced by Brazauskas in his report.

At 1412 GMT, Romas Gudaytis, secretary of the Lithuanian Union of Writers' Party, takes the floor. Gudaytis addresses an appeal to the Polish and Russian delegates:

"I appeal to the Polish and Russian delegates, asking them and at the same time asking myself: Lithuania is your homeland. What are your proposed alternatives to that Lithuania? Is your aim only to negate and reject the ideas of regeneration proposed by us? What are the foundations of your loyalty to yesterday—the light of which is not wanted by us, but you wish it.

"Do your oinions correspond with the opinions of the majority of Russian and Polish Communists and others? In the Baltics, we have felt their warmth and the beating of their hearts for the benefit of our concord. We need this concord—Snieckus and Salcininkai need it, too. We all need it. One does not wish to believe that there are among you a few people who do not care about this land, or our common future."

At 1430 GMT, Ozkelyte reads a report from the Mandate Commission. She announces various specific data concerning the delegates. She says some 81% of the delegates are of Lithuanian nationality, 10.3% are Russian, and 2% are Polish. She says 295 delegates at the congress have been members of the party for more than 24 years. Ozkelyte then speaks about the order of the party organization. She says: "As we all know, in accordance with the order which existed before, the party organizations in military units elected delegates to the city and rayon party conferences. These would later delegate representatives of the military to the party congress. For the first time in the history of the republican party organization, delegates to this congress have been directly elected at primary organizations. The same right was also granted to the party organizations at military units by the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee Plenum. A total of 38 military delegates was elected."

"Having assessed this and bearing in mind that servicemen and members of the Communist Party are not on the books of the republican Communist Party, the Mandate Commission proposes that the mandates of these are not confirmed and that they are allowed to participate in the congress only as guests without a deciding vote."

An officer from the paratroop forces says this decision shows no common sense and is an open challenge to the Soviet Armed Forces. He says the decision will have negative consequences, as the interests of multinational military collectives would clash with those of the indigenous population of Soviet Lithuania. The officer asks the delegates not to be overhasty in regard to this matter.

At 1458 GMT, a vote is taken on the proposal to amend the mandates of servicemen to mandates of guests only. This proposal is not supported by the majority of delegates, with only 139 votes in favor. Therefore, servicemen remain in the congress enjoying full delegate rights.

At 1510 GMT, Aleksey Kulakov, Snieckus City Party COmmittee secretary, voices the opinion that the proposed program should not be adopted and that the Lithuanian Communist Party should remain within the composition of the CPSU.

At 1517 GMT, Vytautas Petkevicius, a writer, takes the floor. He stands for an independent socialist Lithuania and he says he believes that sovereignty of the Lithuanian Communist Party should be decided by a referendum, with all republican party members taking part.

At 1537 GMT, the congress takes a 30-minute break.

At 1608 GMT, the congress resumes. J. Jurkunas, chairman of a collective farm, says an independent Lithuanian Communist Party should be established.

At 1640 GMT, Bronius Genzelis, party secretary of Vilnius University, says Lithuania has turned toward a European civilization. He says that cases of betrayal of national interests by the Lithuanian Communist Party have taken place in the past. He adds that the congress is frightened of blackmail by the servicemen sitting in this congress and has therefore allowed them to vote. He asks if a party which succumbs to the first threat from the military can be trusted. He also asks whose side the Lithuanian Communist Party is on—that of the fifth column or the Lithuanian people.

At 1740 GMT, Mindaugas Stakvilevicius, first secretary of the Siauliai City Party Committee, takes the floor. He states that the delegates to the congress did not succumb to blackmail by the military. R. Gudaitis maintains in his address that they acted wisely, showing the servicemen that they are welcome to join the people of Lithuania in the campaign for an independent Lithuanian Communist Party and a sovereign Lithuanian state.

Following this speech, the congress adjourns its work until 0800 GMT 20 December.

Brazauskas Address at Lithuanian Congress

PM2012124689 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Dec 89 Second Edition p 3

[Special correspondents V. Matulyavichyus, A. Petrushov report: "Lithuanian Communist Party Congress Opens"]

[Text] Vilnius, 19 Dec—The 20th Lithuanian Communist Party Extraordinary Congress began work here today. The mood in the party and the republic is perhaps best indicated by the banners and placards that the city's inhabitants brought to the opera and ballet theater where the Lithuanian Communists' forum opened. Let us cite just a few of them: "Lithuania is a state," "The Lithuanian Communist Party is autonomous," "Avoid a party split," "Give mom her job back," "The party within the state, not the state within the party."

The heat of political passions on the eve of the congress could also be felt in the auditorium. The credentials commission proposed that 43 delegates from the party organizations of military units stationed on Lithuanian territory be stripped of their right to participate in voting and transferred to the status of guests. The reason: Communists in the country's Armed Forces are on the party list in their own political organs and do not form part of the republic party organization. But basically this went against the decision of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee plenum, which approved a quota for the representation of military delegates at the congress. Party veterans, servicemen, and party workers took part in the debate, and then the credentials commission's proposal was put to the vote. It was supported by only 139 delegates out of more than 1,000 who are present at the congress.

Unity or a split—these two positions stand out irreconcilably at the congress. There were three conflicting views in the discussion of the draft programs for the renewal of the republic Communist Party. Some people staunchly uphold the principle of renewing the party within the CPSU, others advocate autonomy for the Communist Party and relations with the CPSU and other parties on partnership terms. The radical Communists see the Lithuanian Communist Party's path in a fully autonomous political party with a change of name.

Some 1,038 delegates assembled in the theater, representing about 200,000 Communists in Lithuania. Some 94% of the delegates have higher and incomplete higher education, and they include 34 doctors of sciences, many representatives of institutes of the Lithuanian Academy of Sciences, teachers, and cultural workers. But there are not many workers—only 18—and even fewer collective farm [kolkhoz] members—only 5, although workers and kolkhoz members account for 48% of the social composition of the republic Communist Party.

On the agenda for the session are the political report of the Central Committee and the discussion of the draft Lithuanian Communist Party program and statutes and its strategy for the immediate future.

The congress delegates honored the memory of USSR People's Deputy Academician A.D. Sakharov with a minute's silence.

The political report was delivered by A. Brazauskas, first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee.

"Lithuanian Communists," he stressed, "are well aware of people's concern about the present economic instability, the slackening of discipline, the threatening ecological situation, the fall in living standards, and the appearance of social injustice. The time has come to prove with concrete deeds what the party and society can do to achieve a radical change for the better."

The speaker noted that the republic Communist Party advocates a sovereign state of Lithuania, by which it means "political independence and an autonomous state domestic and foreign policy." In this connection, in his opinion, the USSR's future lies in a union of sovereign states. The discussion of M.S. Gorbachev's appeal to the Communists of Lithuania showed that a new model of political relations among republican Communist Parties within the country can and must be created. The central union organs, the speaker said, should be formed on a parity basis, and the Politburo should be made up of representatives of all the union republics' Communist Parties.

The speaker mentioned among today's problems in the republic the relationship with the Soviet Army. Although it is often asserted in the republic, he noted, that the Soviet Army should be withdrawn from Lithuania and replaced by national formations, at present it is hard to imagine a noncentralized defense of the country. These questions cannot be resolved with regard to a single republic without changes being made throughout the Union.

The essence of the party's new ideological principles, the report said, lies in historical objectivity, the renunciation of dogmatism and apologetics, and tolerance toward different outlooks. At the same time, A. Brazauskas said, we are opposed to chauvinism, nationalism, political demagoguery, and extremism.

Speaking of the party's economic platform, the republic party leader noted that in discussing these problems it is important to remember that the national economy of Lithuania is closely interwoven with the USSR's economy. Walking barefoot toward autonomy is a mere rallying cry. It will be necessary to continue in future to cooperate closely with the big country's economic structures.

After the report, a political debate began at the congress.

Further on Brazauskas Report

LD1912204689 Moscow TASS in English 2008 GMT 19 Dec 89

[Text] Vilnius December 19 TASS—By TASS special correspondents Anatoliy Aladinskiy, Yuriy Sizov and Kazis Uscila:

The further spread of democracy, the restoration of Lithuanian statehood and the independence of the Lithuanian Communist Party are the fundamental tasks set out in the political report of the Central Committee of the Lithuanian Communist Party to the 20th party congress that opened here today.

Delivering the report, Lithuanian party leader Algirdas Brazauskas emphasised that Communists are well aware of "people's concern over the present economic instability, slackening of discipline, precarious ecological situation, erosion of the living standards and manifestations of social injustice."

The Lithuanian Communists believe that the perestroyka taking place in the country and in the party should bring socialism back within the boundaries "in which it is economically effective, socially comprehended and purposeful."

The report sets out a detailed analysis of the historic path covered by Lithuania over the past 70 years. The report contains a critical analysis of the mistakes made by Communist Party over these years.

Dwelling on questions of political reform in the party, Brazauskas noted that a draft programme and regulations of the Lithuanian Communist Party were submitted to the Congress for discussion.

The speaker said that in order to democratise all the areas of life, Lithuanian Communists are against the ideologisation of economic activity, culture and information. They stand for their natural development.

It is noted in the report that three main views of the Lithuanian Communist Party's future came to light during preparations for the 20th party congress.

According to one view, the Lithuanian Communist Party is a party with its own programme and regulations and with organisational and economic independence. It bases its relations with the Soviet Communist Party on forms suiting reality and this period of transition.

Bruzauskas believes that the other two views are extreme. Acording to one of them, the party should be fully separated from the Soviet Communist Party. The essence of the other view is that the Lithuanian Communist Party still remains a composite part of the Soviet Communist Party, working within its programme and regulations.

The speaker said that the discussion of Mikhail Gorbachev's December address to the Lithuanian Communists showed that a new model of political relations among republican Communist Parties can and must be created.

The leader of the Lithuanian Communist Party proposed that the delegates to the Congress formulate and adopt an address to the 28th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party, to be held in the autumn of next year.

In this connection he suggested that the Congress be held earlier.

Brazauskas said that central federal bodies of the party should be formed on a parity basis and that the Politburo of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee be formed of representatives of all the Communist Parties of Union republics.

The speaker said that one of the current problems in the republic concerns the Soviet Army.

He noted that Lithuanians often say that the Soviet Army shoud be withdrawn from Lithuania and replaced with national units.

He said that at present it is difficult to visualise non-centralised defenses of the country.

He said that these questions cannot be solved with regard to one republic, without having achieved transformations in the federation as a whole.

As regards that party's economic platform, Brazauskas emphasised that during the discussion of these problems it is important to remember that Lithuania's national economy is closely interwoven with the Soviet Union's economy.

"The call to advance to independence in bast sandals is nothing more than a slogan of rallies," he said. "The need for close cooperation among the economic structures of the whole country will persist."

The speaker urged all the people inhabiting Lithuania to unite for the sake of a victorious perestroyka. The Central Committee of the Lithuanian Communist Party believes that a united front of various political forces and various groups can be a form of a political and ideological consensus.

After Brazauskas had delivered the report of the Central Committee of the Lithuanian Communist Party, a political debate started at the Congress.

PRAVDA Report on Sakharov Ceremonies

*PM1912151189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
19 Dec 89 Second Edition p 2*

[TASS report: "On His Final Journey"]

[Text] On 18 December Moscow sent on his final journey Academician Andrey Dmitriyevich Sakharov, a major scientist of modern times, well-known public figure, USSR people's deputy, member of the USSR Academy of Sciences Presidium, and holder of the Nobel Peace Prize.

In the morning the coffin containing the body of the deceased was placed outside the building of the USSR Academy of Sciences Presidium. There were many wreaths by the coffin. They included a wreath from the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and the USSR Council of Ministers and a wreath from the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies.

Comrades M.S. Gorbachev, V.I. Vorotnikov, L.N. Zaykov, V.A. Medvedev, N.I. Ryzhkov, A.N. Yakovlev, Ye.M. Primakov, and I.T. Frolov arrived there. They paid tribute to the memory of A.D. Sakharov and then passed into the building of the USSR Academy of Sciences Presidium to sign the mourning book of condolences.

The previous day tens of thousands of people had taken their leave of the deceased in Moscow's Palace of Youth. They included the heads of a number of foreign states' diplomatic missions accredited in Moscow.

On 18 December many Muscovites and guests of the capital went to a square in Luzhniki, where a civil funeral was held for A.D. Sakharov.

On a large portrait photograph in a mourning frame Andrey Dmitriyevich bowed his head, deep in thought. Members of the commission to organize the funeral and relatives and friends of the deceased stood by the coffin.

The civil funeral was opened by USSR People's Deputy Academician D.S. Likhachev. Addressing the funeral ceremony, participants in the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies, representatives of scientific establishments, of public organizations and movements, and of the clergy, and foreign guests spoke of Andrey Dmitriyevich as an outstanding individual and a man of irreproachable morality, whose name will be mentioned by his descendants alongside the great humanists Tolstoy and Gandhi.

USSR People's Deputies V.A. Palm and A.A. Sobchak, Academician Yu.A. Osipyan, writers Ye.A. Yevtushenko and O.O. Suleymenov, A.D. Sakharov's scientific colleagues, and other speakers pointed to his staunchness as a zealot and a fighter and to his profound adherence to the ideals of democracy and justice. Deeply convinced that peace can be preserved only with equilibrium between the chief opposing forces, A.D. Sakharov devoted many years to the problem of creating hydrogen weapons. At the same time he realized early on the danger to mankind of the extensive production and testing of mass destruction weapons and insistently posed the question of limiting such tests. Nor did speakers overlook the fact that a gross injustice was done to Andrey Dmitriyevich when he was exiled from Moscow. But even while in exile he continued his fruitful involvement with science.

The civil funeral ended. The funeral cortege headed for Vostryakovskoye Cemetery, where A.D. Sakharov was buried in accordance with the will of the deceased's relatives. An outstanding scientist and public figure, a man of honor, who was the embodiment of all the best that we inherited from the great Russian intelligentsia, has departed this life.

Kryuchkov Tells Newswomen Sakharov Exile 'Mistake'

LD1912230889 Moscow TASS in English 2220 GMT 19 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 20 TASS—By TASS correspondent Lyudmila Aleksandrova:

Open-door, Glasnost day at KGB is perhaps the best way to describe the functions held on the premises of KGB of the USSR in Moscow on Tuesday.

For the first time in history women-journalists from many countries visited the Museum of the State Security Committee. They also had a conversation with KGB Chairman Vladimir Kryuchkov.

During the conversation which lasted nearly four hours he answered many questions.

The essence of these answers is that State Security officials realise that many people still distrust them. Painstaking work was started in the framework of Perestroyka policy to dispel this distrust.

Glasnost is needed above all and the meeting held on Tuesday is an evidence of this approach.

Kryuchkov recalled the recent contact of security officials with participants in the manifestation in tribute to the memory of victims of the Stalin repressions. The manifestation was organisd by Memorial Society in Dzerzhinsky Square in Moscow.

The KGB chairman said that security bodies are engaged in consistent work to protect the constitution. Former mistakes of the security bodies were openly and honestly admitted.

This refers not only to lawlessness of the Stalin period but also to not-so-distant past, including actions with regard to so-called dissidents.

Kryuchkov, specially, described as a gross mistake the exile of the late Andrey Sakharov to Gorkiy. He spoke of him with high regard, even though he disagreed with some of his political views.

The KGB chairman summed up the effort to combat organised crime and spoke about prospects for the widening of contacts with Western special services in combatting illicit narcotics traffick, multi-national contraband rings, etc.

He said developing a mechanism to protect commercial secrets in the USSR is a topical question.

There were questions about opening the KGB archives and about the budget of State Security bodies. Kryuchkov said that the KGB budget will soon be announced. He said that in any case the KGB budget is smaller than that of the CIA.

The KGB chairman mentioned for the first time the number of women employed by the KGB. Women make up 14 per cent of all KGB officers and employees. There are 30 per cent of women in the central apparatus and 25 per cent in the KGB apparatus in the provinces.

Rukh Holds First Campaign Rally in Kiev

PM1112160589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Dec 89 Second Edition p 3

[Report by own correspondents M. Odinets and I. Tikhomirov under the rubric "Approaching the Elections": "Why Smash Chairs?"]

[Text] Kiev—The election campaign in the Ukraine immediately got off to a dynamic start. The nomination of candidate deputies to the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet and local soviets is proceeding vigorously and voters are holding rallies. But, unfortunately, extremist outbursts and manifestations of vulgarity and recurrences of unworthy attacks on rivals in the campaigning have already had an impact.

The secretariat of the Ukrainian People's Movement for Perestroyka (Rukh) has held its first campaign rally in Kiev. The rally expressed approval for speeches at the republic's Supreme Soviet sessions by USSR People's Deputies S. Konev, V. Krishevich, L. Sandulyak, and a number of others. The speech by S. Konev, resident clinical physician of the Dnepropetrovsk medical institute's infectious diseases department, was particularly noteworthy because, it is claimed, it gave some outline of the Rukh election program.

One is struck by the USSR people's deputy's extremely unrestrained and impolite tone toward the union and Ukrainian governments. Citing the normative deductions from the profits of union enterprises and organizations to the state budget, the speaker declared: "...Such actions by the union government in forming the USSR State Budget are reminiscent of the swindler who picks someone's pocket, steals all the money and then, by way of atonement, throws a 5-kopek coin to the poor, telling them, cheer up, things aren't as bad as the events of 1932-1933...."

Developing his idea further, the speaker points out that "the union government regards the Ukraine as a hired hand (a 'farm laborer') and the government of the sovereign republic as someone to order about...."

Selecting slightly more insulting images, S. Konev said that the republic's state sovereignty proclaimed by the declaration [not further identified] immediately cuts off the "...grasping hands of the union monopolies, which have chosen the tactics of the Colorado beetle: When they try to exterminate it in one place it just scuttles off to a neighboring plantation, and if the government hasn't grasped that simple truth yet, in a year's time the Ukraine will be the only plantation left."

The orator talks about the Ukrainian SSR in the same coarse tone, too. Citing the normative turnover tax contributions to the state budget, S. Konev assured the crowd: "The series of figures cited indicates that in terms of this indicator the Ukrainian Soviet Republic has served as the 'milk cow' of the union family."

"...How much longer," he asked rhetorically, "will the Ukraine remain gagged, marching under false slogans, and allowing the union bureaucracy to tear to shreds its native land and the nation's future."

The orator even went so far as to say that the Ukraine, which has almost 50% of the world's "deposits" of black earth, is on the brink of a major new famine.

Quite a few participants in the session spoke about the serious and acutely urgent problems in the republic's life. Each time they backed up their arguments with figures, analyzed in depth the situation in the economy, the environment, and culture, and suggested constructive and specific ways to rectify the shortcomings, and there was also criticism of the union and republic governments and other organizations—but it was all done within the framework of the norms and rules adopted for such sessions. But S. Konev's speech, which was full of malice and malevolence, contrasted sharply with the general tone of the discussion and not surprisingly aroused a sense of protest from many deputies.

Here is what T. Burlaka, link leader at the "Pravda" collective farm in Chernovitsy Oblast's Kelmenetskiy Rayon, said from the platform at the session: "I utterly disagree with the views expressed by USSR People's Deputy Comrade Konev. We realise what he and his fellow-thinkers from the people's Rukh movement are after: not unity and consolidation but separation. But all that they are doing is snatching individual facts that suit them. They are doing this deliberately and in the guise of concern for the Ukrainian people so as to win cheap prestige."

S. Konev's speech, leading to the complication of the situation and to separatism, was condemned by Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet Deputies Comrades A. Bulyanda, N. Lavrukhin, Yu. Olenenko, and others. They said that his speech is a politically irresponsible act, an unconcealed attempt to set the party and government against the people and provoke increased destabilization processes; it is unjustified exploitation of trouble spots in the people's history, and outright intimidation of the public. The people's parliamentarian has no right to act that way, deputies said.

Nevertheless, just a day later selected passages from the people's deputy's well-stocked speech were eagerly quoted at a Rukh campaign rally. Is one of its leaders setting the right tone in the election campaigning?

The Ukrainian People's Movement for Perestroyka intends to wage a serious campaign for deputies' seats. But I think that the kind of "parliamentary" vocabulary introduced by S. Konev will hardly be accepted by the broad circles. But should those who are hoping to profit from criticism and abuse of the government and party really be taken seriously?

Of course, struggles are struggles, and that goes for the campaign struggle, with its rules, framework, and etiquette. In the heat of this struggle people accidentally go too far, they lose their sense of proportion, and all kinds of things happen. But why smash chairs, as a hero of the classics said....

Opposition Figure Views Ukrainian Perestroyka

AU1912105589 Warsaw GAZETA WYBORCZA in Polish 6 Dec 89 p 6

[Interview with Mikhailo Horyn, secretary of the Ukrainian Helsinki Association and head of secretariat of the Ukrainian Movement for Perestroyka, by Waclaw Bialy: "The Flying Elephant"]

[Text] [Horyn] A new-born elephant is large and weighs a couple of tonnes. It is, however, a baby and requires care and protection before it can gain strength and mature. Our movement is like a little baby elephant. It was born recently, but it already has 300,000 members, an organization center in every region, and is quite capable of attracting tens of thousands of people for every large rally. As yet, it has not sufficiently built up its organizational structure or an information network. It prints its papers in Vilnius and Riga. It has strength, but at the same time it is weak.

[Bialy] How strong is the Ukrainian Helsinki Association?

[Horyn] The association is a continuation of the Ukrainian Helsinki Group which restarted activity in 1985 after a break of several years due to intense persecution. In 1988 it transformed itself into the Ukrainian Helsinki Association. We are a small association of some 1,000 people. I am somewhat embarrassed to have to say it, but the association enjoys great prestige and authority, and this was visibly evident at the Congress of the Ukrainian Movement for Perestroyka which was held in Kiev in September. Its great authority also comes from the fact that most of the people active in the association have served many years in prison and labor-camps. It is rare for anyone in our association to have served less than 10 years.

[Bialy] You have served 12 years imprisonment in total, and the last court verdict in 1981 sentenced you to 15 years imprisonment....

[Horyn] They do not sentence us to 15 years now. At the most it is 15 days now. According to De Tocqueville's law, a slackening of the pressure of repression causes opposition and democratic movements to proliferate rapidly.

[Bialy] What other organizations are active in the Ukraine?

[Horyn] There is the Ukrainian National-Democratic League, which is still fairly small with only several hundred members. The league is demanding Ukrainian independence. There is the Ukrainian Christian-Democratic Front, which is linked to the Ukrainian Catholic Church, and it too has similar political aims. These two organizations and the Ukrainian Helsinki Association form the so-called radical wing.

[Bialy] What about the center?

[Horyn] The Ukrainian Movement for Perestroyka [Rukh] occupies the center ground. It is also the largest of all the organizations. It is demanding that the Soviet Union be transformed into a federation of states. Additionally, it is calling for the limitation of the various privileges of the centers in favor of the republics. We have some quite absurd situations as a result. Shelest, secretary of the Communist Party of the Ukraine, has said that in order to build a public building in Kiev, one had to apply to Moscow for the funds. We want to see a situation where all the wealth of the Ukraine belongs to its people.

[Bialy] The Ukraine is sitting on a nuclear time-bomb....

[Horyn] Chernobyl was a great Ukrainian tragedy, but at the same time it united the whole of Ukrainian society. The independence of the Ukraine is an issue for all its citizens, Ukrainians, Russians, Poles, Jews, Tatars, and all the others. Everybody is aware that they are living under a Chernobyl threat. This may be one of the reasons why the Ukraine has no "Interfront" organization.

Chernobyl also exposed the immorality and the inhuman face of the party elite. Secretary Shcherbitskiy sent his children to the south, but he ordered all other people to march in Kiev on the 1st of May 1986.

[Bialy] There are to be elections in the Ukraine on 4 March 1990.

[Horyn] We have decided to form a united block of democratic forces. On 18 November we had the first meeting of representatives of various democratic movements in the Ukraine. Apart from the representatives of the "Movement," there were the representatives of the Ukrainian Helsinki Association; the Ukrainian National-Democratic League; the Miners Strike Committee; an ecological movement called "Green World;" the Ukrainian Language Society; and representatives of the "Memorial" society. There were also people from the Ukrainian Catholic Church Defense Committee, and even people from the Komsomol. We agreed to publish a joint manifesto for the Ukrainian people which will be our electoral platform. First, we are demanding the abolition of Article 6 of the Constitution, that is to say the abolition of the leading role of the Communist Party, and the liquidation of party monopolies and privileges. We now have the practical task facing us, namely, the selection of our election candidates and support for them during the election campaign. We want to avoid a situation whereby candidates of the democratic block organizations compete against one another. That is why the interim elections in the regions will be an important stage in this process. I believe the election campaign will forge the organizational network of the movement. If his happens, the baby elephant will get up on its feet.

[Bialy] Is the Ukraine totally blue and yellow now?

[Horyn] The rebirth of national consciousness is happening very fast. We only needed several months to reclaim all that had been taken from us over the last 70 years. When we arrived to hold a meeting in one of the villages and we began unfurling the blue and yellow flag, all the boys who had gathered around started running away. After a while I realized that they had not run away from us, but had all rushed home to fetch their own blue and yellow flags.

[Bialy] There are Poles who fear Ukrainian nationalism.

[Horyn] I am not aware of any Ukrainian organization—even the most radical—which is raising the issue of borders. I think that when we get to know each other better we shall see that the Ukrainians are not running around with knives between their teeth, and the Poles are not thinking of occupying the Ukraine as far as the River Zbrucz. A meeting between Poles and Ukrainians, which I hope can take place next spring after the elections, will bring us closer together. This will be a kind of "roundtable" of Ukrainians and Poles from Poland, and Ukrainians and Poles from the Ukraine, and without doubt, Poles and Ukrainians from all over the world. It will be thus a "roundtable" of four, or maybe six sides.

[Bialy] Where will this meeting take place?

[Horyn] It ought to take place in Lvov. That is the most appropriate place.

[Bialy] Will the "Movement" be able to organize such a meeting? After all, the Ukraine still lags behind the Baltic states.

[Horyn] I shall reply using a little anecdote. A schoolteacher once asked her children to name all the animals that can fly. The children began to answer: Pigeon, eagle, a fly, and so on. However, one of the children cries out: An elephant. An elephant? Have you ever seen an elephant fly?—asks the surprised teacher. No Miss, I have not—retorts the child—but if it should ever take off....

General Procuratorate Official on Moldavia Unrest

90UN0421A Kishinev SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA in Russian 19 Nov 89 p 3

[Report on interview with Aleksey Ilyich Nikolayev, senior assistant of the USSR general procurator, administration director, and state counselor of justice 2d class, by S. Gamova: "Only the Law Should Dictate"; date, place of interview not given]

[Text] The events that took place in the capital of the republic on 7 and 10 November and the disturbances committed during these days continue to be discussed by the public, and the questions are naturally heard: Specifically who is at fault, and what measures are investigative organs taking in this regard?

Insofar as it is the procuracy which is conducting the investigation, it would only be natural to address these questions to them, and this is what we have done. Thus, we got the opportunity to obtain the information firsthand.

Our guest is Aleksey Ilyich Nikolayev, senior assistant of the USSR general procurator, administration director, and state counselor of justice 2d class. He has recently worked in all the "hot spots" of the country. In Nagorno-Karabakh he investigated mass disturbances for 9 months, then in Yerevan worked on the affair concerning seizure of the airport at Zvartnots. Today he works with the Moldavian Procuracy. His aim is to provide assistance to republic organs.

Mr Nikolayev.

[Nikolayev] The USSR Procuracy and other central law enforcement organs always render assistance to the republics in investigating especially serious, complicated cases. These are cases which we, as a rule, have taken upon ourselves to handle. But this time we decided to depart from tradition. It is absolutely necessary to do this in exceptional instances, but in others, local organs of authority and local law-enforcement organs are in a position to—and in fact must—themselves get engaged in the analysis of such cases and conduct the investigation. Often it happens that all claims arising with respect to conflicts on interethnic grounds—and these are quite crucial—are addressed to the USSR General Prosecutor and USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs (MVD), while local organs are left in the shadows.

[Gamova] Is the responsibility shifting?

[Nikolayev] Yes, essentially it is shifting, to the extent that a revision was made in this regard. All the more so in that we have qualified people working on the local levels entirely capable of handling the situation. Then, too, the very fact of participating in a painstaking investigation of events enables local-level personnel to get closer to these events, analyze them more thoroughly, and precisely determine the role they should play in averting conflict situations.

[Gamova] All the same, does there exist a need for assistance?

[Nikolayev] All the same, even in this situation we think it necessary to assist the investigation. The team that was created here to investigate the events of 7 and 10 November consists of the best trained personnel of the Moldavian Procuracy and police department; nonetheless, it was decided to augment it. Military investigators were therefore attached to this team, as were investigators from the Ukrainian and Belorussian union republics. Thus, the team is interethnic in its composition. These people are capable of looking into everything objectively, getting it all done without delay down to the most minute detail.

The disturbances caused a great deal of material damage—preliminary figures put it at somewhere around half a million rubles. And there has been tremendous moral and ethical damage. Many victims. About 200 military personnel and MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] employees sustained injuries—some seriously.

But this is one side of the question. There is another, and it can be formulated as a conclusion. In our time, when we see quite a number of problems in the social sphere, in the economic arena and many other areas of social life, when difficulties are felt as a result of the perestroyka process and all of this has to be resolved—it is a time when attempts are made to achieve resolution with the use of force. And then we see a threat to constitutional principles, social welfare, the lives, dignity, and health of the Soviet people. This we cannot allow. We must resolutely and uncompromisingly fight against it. If we wish to see a law-governed society—and it is precisely such a society which we are building—all problems, including those of interethnic relations, must be resolved in a democratic fashion, based on the principles of our Constitution and the law.

[Gamova] Probably not enough time has passed for producing a complete analysis, but is there some kind of judgment, nonetheless?

[Nikolayev] What hits us right away, even at this early date? A certain peculiar speculation arises around the events in question; they are overgrown with unbelievable rumors. Already at the very outset of the investigation there are people attempting to arrive at definitive conclusions. Thus, the opinion is being expressed that the police are guilty of everything; and those who ransacked the MVD building and set fire to it, who beat up policemen and military personnel, emerge in the role of blameless people who just happened to be there. Well, the problem is far more complicated. It is alarming that such thoughts are expressed on the pages of certain periodicals, including issue 47 of LITERATURA SHI ARTA, and were heard as well at a People's Front press conference. In this manner an attempt is made to foist all responsibility for the events on the internal affairs organs. The question naturally arises: To whose benefit is this? A well thought-out, objective analysis must be made. It is still too early to be talking about conclusions: We must conduct a thorough investigation, and this is why we are here. The General Procurator directed me to ensure an objective investigation here, including a thorough examination into the legality of police actions. Only after this is done will we be able to inform the public as to the reasons and circumstances regarding these events, and who is to blame.

Now, at the very outset of the investigation, attempts are being made to formulate public opinion. They are one-sided and subjective, and unlawful methods are being used in this regard. The justification, so to speak, is provided by the publications already mentioned. Even now there is some kind of parallel investigation being conducted—the "interrogation" and "cross- examination" of certain persons is reported. What kind of objectivity can be seen here?

In our state the function of investigation is entrusted to state organs and the investigative apparatus, in accordance with the constitution and our laws. They alone can conduct the investigation within the strict framework of the law, and, as we know, a final determination as to the guilty parties is made by the court. What kind of objectivity can we rely on in the depositions of people questioned, now that a one-sided flow of information has come crashing down upon them? This is intolerable.

We are prepared to cooperate with the mass media in informing the public about the course of the investigation—so that no one gets the idea that someone wants to shield someone else. The truth is above all.

My bitter experience in investigating such matters shows that everything here is developed roughly around the same scenario—the shielding of people who have participated in illegal acts leading to people's injury, property damage, etc. The public and mass media must provide assistance now in an objective, speedy, and highly competent investigation. This is our general task.

[Gamova] You spoke about a certain similarity between the spire of events here and in other regions where interethnic conflicts have arisen...

[Nikolayev] Let me share the following ideas here. Somehow it happens that the main burden of normalizing the situation is brought to bear on the law enforcement organs which protect the interests of the state, the Soviet Constitution, and the constitutions of the union republics. Here we notice an indecisiveness on the part of local party and soviet personnel in conducting extensive clarification activities with the people. Open debate is conducted poorly in the public gardens, in the squares, and on the streets. But this could remove bastions of tension and avert a tragic development of events.

We should not put our trust in the abilities of law enforcement organs alone. These will come to bear only when the actions of procuracy and police are based on the people's self-consciousness, on the assistance and support of the public and labor collectives. Right now, purposefully or not, the impression is being created that attempts are being made to drive a wedge between the community, the workers, and law enforcement organs, to sow seeds of mistrust.

[Gamova] Rumors are evidently playing a role here. We must admit there are many of them—on who participated in the disturbances, and on "general" searches and arrests being conducted by the procuracy...

[Nikolayev] We are far from reaching final conclusions. Nonetheless, we can state by way of information that among those taken to the MVD during the disturbances (70 individuals), 17 had been on trial previously, and many were not sober. Presently we see diverse points of view in the discussion as to who is behind this. Some say all this has taken place under People's Front influence, others say that the disturbances arose spontaneously, that the situation could not be foreseen. There are even some who say that these actions were provoked by the police. I will not attempt—nor do I have the right—to judge who is correct at this time. But the investigation will provide that information. Therefore, we must not interfere in it.

Among the participants in the disturbances were many juveniles, and this presents a tragic element.

Again, concerning rumors, people are indeed talking about general arrests and detentions, etc. This is gross fabrication. And we are in no way measuring the results of the investigation by the number of people arrested and detained, especially since we are talking about juveniles. Here, it is felt, we must use our entire arsenal of educational measures as well.

Several searches were conducted, during which provocative pamphlets, homemade handcuffs, military and police ammunition, sharpened metal spikes, etc. were confiscated.

The investigation will look into who needed these and for what reason. We will not drag the matter out, but haste would be dangerous here. The effectiveness of our work will also depend on how the public and various social organizations assist the investigation.

United Workers Front's View of Elections

90UN0436A Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 2 Dec 89 p 1

[Article by S. Razin: "Session of the Leningrad Soviet: We Will Do Without Tinkering With Democracy"]

[Text] As we have already reported, a session of the Leningrad Soviet rejected the concept of elections to the local soviets in production electoral okrugs.

Passions aroused by this concept came to a boil as early as this summer when the leaders of the United Front of Workers (OFT) referring to the works of Lenin made their vision of the coming elections extensively known to the public.

The idea was simple: Deputies of the local soviets are to be elected in production okrugs rather than in territorial okrugs by the entire populace, as was the case before. The slogan was "a plant is an electoral okrug." As the authors of the concept explained the innovation, the representation of the working class in the organs of power will be ensured more precisely and reliably in this manner. Democratic, isn't it? Progressive, isn't it?

Overnight, an avalanche of protest letters signed by more than 10,000 people came down of the Lengorispolkom [Executive Committee of the Leningrad City Soviet].

The Leningraders objected categorically to any tinkering with democracy.

However, soon the situation in the city became tense again. After the session of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet which authorized such experimenting at the discretion of local organs, the discussion of the same issue flared up with renewed strength. For the first time in recent years, an extremely tense political situation emerged in Leningrad. On two occasions, a live chain stretched from the central post office to the building of the Lengorispolkom. Judging by the correspondence sent, about 100,000 people participated in the mass action "Telegram."

Meanwhile, the OFT concept was supported by no more than 3,000 people. It appeared to be absolutely clear what the electorate wanted. However, the atmosphere was increasingly tense.

"There are three kinds of lies—plain lies, shameless lies, and statistics"—declared one of the influential proponents of the production principle. This is why the letters of Leningraders are not necessarily indicative of anything. And what do the workers' referendums held at the Neva and Kirov Plants, at Skorokhod, and at many other enterprises say? The result is: More than 85% of workers are against production okrugs. However, if the opinion of the workers themselves seems not to be convincing I will quote a prediction by sociologists. If a city-wide referendum on this issue were to be held in Leningrad, the Center for the Study and Analysis of Social Processes predicts an unambiguous result: No more than 20% of the population would come out in favor of production okrugs, and no less than 52% would come out against them; that is, twice as many people. A great proportion of the proponents of the OFT concept is found among the apparatus functionaries (44%) and unskilled workers (34%).

This prediction has been confirmed quite eloquently in the past 2 weeks. Along with the major enterprises whose interests lie so close to the hearts of OFT ideologues, the trade unions of Leningrad, the Komsomol [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League] of Leningrad, almost all rayon executive committees, and, finally, the Lengorispolkom in the person of its chairman, V. Khodyrev, came out against experiments with the elections. The presidium of the executive committees held two meetings on this topic, and had every right to end the sharp discussion. It came out that the OFT proposal is absolutely incomplete and ill- conceived. At present, it is simply impossible to hold elections in production okrugs. All current electoral okrugs would have to be repatterned to this end.

V. Khodyrev desperately argued: "We are not ready!", but OTF ideologues continued to attack him. Having their own deputies in the Leningrad Soviet, they requested an extraordinary session hoping to get their draft approved. The session had to be convened. What kind of arguments did the OTF have in store in order to make the Leningraders change their minds?

"We switched from production okrugs introduced on Lenin's initiative to territorial okrugs in 1936 after Stalin's constitution was introduced. We followed the example of other countries. However, was this the right example? Exploiters were in power in these states!"

"Leningrad lives off major industrial enterprises, and this is why we propose to hold elections to the Leningrad Soviet in production okrugs only. Combining the worker and the citizen in one person is the nature and essence of socialism and communism."

"If the deputies of the Leningrad Soviet do not adopt the production principle at present this will be a historic mistake which can still be averted now. It is hard to predict what will happen to our country in 5 years when the laws now being developed by the USSR Supreme Soviet gain strength. However, I guarantee that this will be the abandonment of positions of socialism and communism. The Soviet people will never forgive us for this...."

I borrowed the above excerpts from the speeches of scientists, prominent economic functionaries, and workers. In Leningrad, their names are known to everyone. B.V. Gidaspov, first secretary of the party oblast and city committees, said in his speech at the extraordinary session of the Leningrad Soviet that the concept of production okrugs appears very attractive to him. Millions of viewers followed the session live on TV. The deputies found production okrugs unacceptable for two main reasons. First of all, this approach to holding elections to the local soviets deprives a majority of the populace of democratic rights; secondly, production okrugs freeze in place the current cumbersome monopolistic economy.

What goals do the OFT representatives who argue for their principles so zealously in all echelons set for themselves? Many things became clear for me after I familiarized myself with key provisions aired at the recent scientific-practical conference of the United Front of Workers: "Maintaining the present course toward the enhancement of market relations will bring about the collapse and disintegration of our country. The Law on Cooperatives has struck a powerful blow at the socialist economy. We should not allow all-people's property to be undermined."

So, are we to move forward toward stagnation? Maybe, toward new Stalinism? Despite the populist slogans "Down With Fat Cats!", "Down With the Shadow Economy!", and "Reduce Prices!", a majority of the Leningraders did not take this bait and discerned clearly the true goals of the OTF ideologues. Not too many of those who desire to go back to barracks socialism were found. According to the data of the sociologists, more than a million Leningraders support the radical-democratic platform, and their number continues to grow with every passing day. At present, associations of voters are being created in all rayons of Leningrad, and committees of local self-government are formed in which any candidate may openly expound his electoral platform.

Can a worker nominate himself a candidate? He can. However, workers as well have to go to the people and prove their right to be deputies. In voting for this principle, the Leningraders are unambiguously voting for democratic socialism, for moving ahead. I believe that this is the main result of the extraordinary session of the Leningrad Soviet.

Azerbaijan Council of Elders Established

NC2012120089 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1700 GMT 15 Dec 89

[Text] The leading officials of the ministries, main administrations, and party and soviet organs, who were invited to attend the first meeting of the republic's recently established Council of Elders, had to reply to serious questions that are troubling every single citizen of the republic.

Yusupov, deputy minister of internal affairs of the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR]; Dzhafarov, member of the Azerbaijan SSR Nagorno-Karabakh [NKAO] Organization Committee; Kasumova, secretary of the Baku City Party Committee; and representatives of scientific and creative intellectuals and the Popular Front of Azerbaijan participated in the open debate that took place. This debate concerned the problems of the republic, the decision adopted by the USSR Supreme Soviet on the measures required to normalize the situation in the NKAO, the measures required to realize the decision adopted by the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee in connection with the tasks of the republic's party, soviet, and social organizations as derived from the USSR Supreme Soviet's decision, and the problems of the thousands of refugees who have fled from Armenia to Azerbaijan.

The new social organization was created as a result of an initiative undertaken by a group of learned individuals in the republic.

Use of Azeri Language Said 'Unsatisfactory'

NC2012115189 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1700 GMT 16 Dec 89

[Text] The meeting held at the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee Ideology Department examined the implementation so far of the decision adopted by the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee on measures to provide for a more effective use of the Azerbaijani [as heard] language as the state language in the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic. Scholars, literary men, and employees in the field of fine arts participated in the work of the meeting.

It was noted during the exchange of views that, regardless of the work being carried out in this regard, the use of the Azerbaijani language in the ministries, main administrations, establishments, organizations, and soviet organs is still unsatisfactory. The opportunities created for the Azerbaijani language to be used as the state language are not being properly taken. This state of affairs impedes the maintenance of a (?multisided) language policy in the republic.

Written exchanges between ministries and administrations and their affiliated establishments and city, rayon, and rural organizations are very often only in the Russian language, as in the past. This creates justified uneasiness in the Azerbaijani intellectuals and work collectives. The situation of commercials, advertisements, and [word indistinct] in Baku in particular must be radically improved.

Committees have been established. They will investigate the way the decision is being realized in the ministries and establishments—primarily in the republic's popular education, culture, and health ministries and in the new refinery in Baku. The practical proposals and recommendations that will be made for a more effective use of the Azerbaijani language will be examined in detail after the situation has been carefully studied in the field.

The establishment of a joint committee of the representatives of the republic's scholars and intellectuals was proposed with a view to creating popular control over the realization of the decision.

Ratib (?Aliyev), chief of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee Ideology Department, participated in the work of the meeting.

Azerbaijan Animal Husbandry 'Backwardness' Noted

NC2012114589 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1700 GMT 18 Dec 89

[Text] The meeting held at the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] State Committee for the Agro-Industrial Complex examined matters related to the organization and future of the overwintering of herds, the supply of meat, milk, and other animal husbandry products to the republic's people, the situation of the production and sale of these products, and the improvement of the work and livelihood conditions of livestock and cattle breeders. The experts of the State Committee for the Agro-Industrial Complex, scientists, and leading officials of the rayon agro-industrial unions and agrarian establishments participated in the meeting. M. Abdullayev, first deputy chairman of the Azerbaijan SSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the Azerbaijan SSR State Committee for the Agro-Industrial Complex, addressed the convocation.

It was noted that the soviet and economic organs and the collectives of animal husbandry firms in various rayons have been allowing slackness in their work and causing backwardness. They have not been taking effective measures to increase the production of animal husbandry products in winter.

The importance of putting into effect all the measures required to increase the availability of meat, milk, and other animal husbandry products in as short a time as possible was emphasized.

The participants of the meeting said that there is a need for [word indistinct] in the work of the pertinent departments for the organized overwintering of livestock and herds. The ways and means of maintaining a constant supply of fodder, electricity, water, and construction and other materials to animal husbandry firms, winter [word indistinct], and wintering centers were established.

It was noted that scientific and methodical help is required to further upgrade animal husbandry work in the republic.

Zaim-zade, chief of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee Agriculture and Food Industry Department, participated in the work of the meeting.

Azerbaijan Supreme Soviet Views Economic Plan

NC2012094489 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 0440 GMT 17 Dec 89

[From the republican press review]

[Text] The general meeting of the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet plan and budget commission and the other permanent commissions was held under Ziyad Samed-zade on 15 November [as heard]. The commissions initially examined the drafts of the state plan for Azerbaijan SSR's economic and social development in 1990 and the state budget for 1990, as submitted by the republic's Council of Ministers, how the development plan has been implemented in 1989, and the account on the realization of the state budget for 1988.

Eight perparatory committees held more than 30 meetings from 1 to 12 December. The meetings heard briefings by the Azerbaijan SSR ministries and main administrations, union level organizations and establishments in the republic, and various people's deputies soviet executive committees. With the consent of the Azerbaijan SSR Council of Ministers, the deputies familiarized themselves with the various views, suggestions, and proposals put forward by the preparatory committees during the debate of the plan and the budget.

Deputy Ziyad Samed-zade summed up the debates. The committees empowered him to address the session that will be held on the matter.

Naim Fataliyev, deputy chairman of the Azerbaijan SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, participated in the work of the meetings. You can read a more detailed report in today's newspapers on the preparatory work that has been carried out prior to the meeting to be held by the Azerbaijan SSR Supreme Soviet.

Armenian Committee Set Up for Repatriates

NC1312141689 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 0545 GMT 13 Dec 89

[From the review of KHORHRDAYIN HAYASTAN]

[Text] The paper published the decree of the Presidium of the republic's Supreme Soviet on the creation of a state committee for the reception and settlement of Armenians returning from diaspora to the Armenian republic. This committee will be attached to the Council of Ministers of the Armenian republic, as will the administration of citizens who have left their permanent places of residence.

Muslim Clergy To Be Trained for 'Harmony'

PM2411151789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 2

[Own correspondent A. Dzhalilov dispatch: "An Institute of Higher Education for Followers of Islam"]

[Text] Baku—Lessons have started for the first students at a unique educational establishment in the Caucasus—the Baku Madrasah under the Transcaucasus Muslims Spiritual Administration.

Having received the status of a theological higher educational establishment, it has in fact become the USSR's third most important center (after the Tashkent Islamic Institute and the Bukhara "Mir-Arab" Madrasah) for training Islamic clergy.

Under the entry requirements, the applicants have a competitive interview at which they are tested not only for their general standard of knowledge in the secondary education framework but also their singing ability and their skill in reading the Islamic holy book—the Koran.

"The long-awaited opening of this seminary," Khadzhi Sabir Gusein ogli Gasanov, deputy chairman of the Transcaucasus Muslims Spiritual Administration, said in a conversation with your IZVESTIYA correspondent, "is in keeping with the times, and it really testifies to the striking changes in Soviet people's secular and spiritual life and internal emancipation and to the expanding democratization of society. Suffice it to say that before the beginning of the current year there were only 18 working mosques in Azerbaijan, whereas now there are 39. In the current conditions, conducive to spiritual development and the development of individual freedoms, our aim is to train a new generation of clergy to think in a new way that is not at all fanatical or superstitious, and consequently to be sensitive to the pain of others and preach values common to all mankind such as benevolence, mercy, friendship, and harmony."

Baykal Region Economic Paper Published

LD1112185389 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0900 GMT 10 Dec 89

[Summary] The first edition of REGION, a new Baykal region economic newspaper has appeared in Chita. It publishes information about the development of international cooperation and the cooperative movement, finance problems, market studies, and Soviet and foreign legislation relating to economic and trade relations.

Sverdlovsk Convict's 'Token' Fast Described

LD0812214689 Moscow TASS in English 1902 GMT 8 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 8 TASS—As was already reported, a meeting was held in Leningrad on December 6. At that meeting, 40,000 Leningraders expressed support and approval of the changes taking place in society.

People were candid and sincere in debates, and their speeches expressed concern over problems common to all.

Unfortunately, there were also statements in quite a different vein. Statements were made that can be taken as merely uninformed or deliberately irresponsible.

A certain Popadichenko, who said he was a member of the Democratic Union, asserted at the meeting that S. Kuznetsov's life is in danger. Kuznetsov was convicted in Sverdlovsk for resisting arrest and slandering a militiaman. Popadichenko asserted that Kuznetsov was tortured and subjected to indignities.

V. Chekmarev, deputy chief of the Interior Department of the Sverdlovsk region, told TASS that Kuznetsov is being held in investigation ward number one in Sverdlovsk. He threatened to fast but it has a token nature. The convict drinks broth, tea, condensed milk, raw eggs and fruit juice.

Due to medical attention, Kuznetsov feels satisfactory. He takes walks. His blood pressure is 110 by 70. His life is not in danger, and he admitted as much in an interview to the local press the other day.

No physical or psychological pressure was used on him. Quite recently the convict was visited by People's Deputy V. Shmotyev, Chekmarev said.

Biryukova on Light Industry's Independence

LD0812091989 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 7 Dec 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] For the Second Congress of People's Deputies the government has prepared a program of measures to improve the economy and a fundamental elaboration of the 5-year plan.

[Reporter Ye. Mironova] The aim of the visits being made by Aleksandra Pavlovna Biryukova to enterprises is to acquaint people with these drafts and to check them once more in practice, at the work place, to determine more precisely where there are problems in production itself and human problems. I spoke to her at the Moscow Knitwear Association.

[Begin recording] [Mironova] I would like to refer not only to this enterprise, not only to knitwear makers—the situation here is perhaps better than anywhere else—but to light industry in general. Having received some degree of independence, it has started, well, to abuse it, and to raise prices and to reduce the quantity of cloth used in garments. What way do you see out of this so that neither will their hands be tied nor will we be left without clothes?

[Biryukova] The light industry, just like any other sector of industry producing consumer goods, will be one of the first—and especially light and local industry—to change over to new forms of management and to new forms of ownership. Alongside purely state enterprises there will be joint-stock enterprises, leased enterprises, mixed enterprises, cooperative-state enterprises; that is to say, we need to untie their hands so that there are many goods, various goods, and that they can compete.

[Mironova] This combine is an example of this. It is only 9 months ago that it changed over to leasing, and at once raised people' stake in it. As a result, they raised productivity. It managed to raise the wages of everyone without exception, and to raise all manner of monetary subsidies for holidays, for cooperative shares. They simply built an apartment block and their own kindergarten. On the whole, there is a multitude of plans which are backed with money.

[Biryukova] This industry will be one of the first to change over to the market mechanism. Prices will be established in accordance with supply and demand and will reflect the necessary labor costs, the raw material contribution, new equipment, and, most important—just like market prices are formed in an other country—supply and demand and competititon between various enterprises belonging to and pertaining to various forms of ownership. But in doing so, when creating a socialist market, the state will always ensure a guaranteed living standard for individual sectors of the populace. Above all the state must set limits for and regulate the children's range of goods so that it should not be expensive, so that it should be accessible for any child, whether or not he is in a well-off family, whether it is a single child or a two-child family or a family with many children.

Secondly, we will always regulate and see it to it that consumer goods are accessible to such sectors of the populace as pensioners and disabled people, who have a limited income. [end recording]

[Mironova] The subjects of modern re-equipping, of providing enterprises with raw materials, and social programs remained outside the framework of our interview, but they were the main subjects of the conversations in the workshops. [video shows Biryukova addressing a meeting of workers and chatting with her guides and the female workers]

Biryukova, Others Attend Soiree Honoring Author

LD0912112189 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 8 Dec 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] A memorial soiree has been held in the Columned Hall of the House of the Unions, Moscow, devoted to the 100th anniversary of the death of the outstanding classical author of Moldavian and Rumanian literature, Mihai Eminescu. Those who spoke at the soiree talked of Eminescu's great contribution to the treasure house of the world's literature and of the lasting significance of his work. Attending the soiree were Comrades Biryukova, Girenko, Luchinskiy, first secretary of the Central Committee of Moldavia's Communist Party, and representatives of the Soviet public.

Deputies, Others View Draft Press Law

90US0288A Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian 9 Dec 89 p 3

[Set of statements by USSR people's deputies and journalists on the Press Law: "Debate on the Freedom of the Press"]

[Text] "The free press is the keen eye of the popular spirit, the embodiment of the faith of a people in its own self, the talking binds which tie a separate individual to the state and the entire world; the free press is embodied culture which transforms material struggle into spiritual struggle and idealizes its coarse material form. The free press is a frank confession of the people to itself, and it is known that an open-hearted confession is salutary. The free press is a spiritual mirror in which the people sees itself; after all, knowledge of the self is the first prerequisite for wisdom. The free press is the spirit of the state which is delivered to each shack at a lesser expense than the physical means giving light. The press is comprehensive, omnipresent, and all-knowing. The free press is an ideal world which continuously spouts from actual reality and flows back into it as a life-giving stream in the form of constantly increasing spiritual wealth."
Karl Marx.

Valentin Logunov, USSR people's deputy:

Without Glasnost Rationing

In essence, the debate on the draft Law on the Press and Mass Media in the Supreme Soviet was caused by the interpretations of constitutional rights and freedoms, and consequently the principles of reflecting them in the laws, which were different in principle. In the speeches of the opponents of the committees project, the contrasting of the freedom of the press and the good of the people was found. They demanded to hear explanations as to which freedom of the press serves the people and which is detrimental to it.

Please note that it is not the freedom of speech, rallies, and meetings that is beneficial but some special freedom, the kind "the people are demanding," i.e., restrictions (it was even observed that our society is just not ready yet to have the Law on the Press adopted). Previously, such restrictions were absolute and were expressed in the complete absence of executive regulations ensuring the rights of citizens in the environment of the overall lack of freedom for our society asserted by the command-administrative system. The new laws protecting these rights have been continuously pared down by the apparatus since their development began. Now they have suggested that the current Supreme Soviet get involved in working out such restrictions. In turn, the authors of the draft law adopted first by the committees and subsequently by the session of the Supreme Soviet in the first reading based it on the concept of defending the freedom of the press restricted only by the constitutional requirements to shield the society from calls for the forcible overthrow of the existing state and social system, propaganda of war, racial, ethnic, and religious exclusivity or intolerance, dissemination of pornography, incitement of other criminal acts, divulging state secrets, and insulting the person and dignity of citizens. In the opinion of the authors, there should be no other restrictions. This freedom of the press is for the good of the people.

Do we need the Press Law at present? To my mind, it is absolutely necessary. When you decide where and how to go it is better not to stay on the low ground or in the swamp but to climb a hill in order to see further and better. The Law on the Press is such a mountain for us. We should not delay climbing it. The political process would develop much more assertively and purposefully if the law were to be adopted as soon as at this session, and there was such an opportunity. The same elections to the local soviets permeated by the light of independent glasnost in the field would be safeguarded from having the voters feel their way around in the dark. However, they kept postponing, rescheduling, and delaying the discussion as if on purpose in order to prevent the voters from having a thought-through, legally verified, democratic law.

Glasnost is a condition, an inalienable attribute of a democratic society. There cannot be more of glasnost or less of it; it cannot be central or regional. It either exists or it does not. We did not have it. This is why it became necessary to proclaim **the policy of glasnost** as a party program of establishing glasnost. The Law on the Press is one of the steps on the way toward glasnost as a condition of society. However, even having adopted this law our society will still have to climb this step. There will be obstacles.

It is known how they interfere with implementing reasonable laws and sober-minded decisions in our country—by exploiting our poverty, by rationing, by having everything done traditionally in private, through connections and arrangements, by the power being held by the same people locally. Even if the foundations of the law adopted in the first reading are not going to be cut down and emasculated later this does not mean that it is going to be easy to proceed from the law. Printing plants and publishing houses report to specific local owners; paper is allocated from the center. Therefore, the registration procedure rather than the licensing procedure for setting up publications, even if it ends up in the law ultimately adopted, will not be that easy to actually implement. I believe that the struggle for the legal support of the freedom of the press will proceed with mixed results.

The situation in the market of newspapers and magazines will not change all at once; it will change gradually. However, ultimately such a situation should come about that the main right of the person in a democratic society, the right to choose, will be ensured. The reader will select himself the periodical in which he finds the most adequate reflection of his political and other interests, the one which would support him and help him defend his convictions. In essence, such processes have already begun with the beginning of the policy of glasnost. This, however, is just the beginning.

Veniamin Yarin, USSR people's deputy

If Millionaires Were Journalists

When the Law on the Press was discussed at the session my name was mentioned from the rostrum in a context which was somewhat unexpected for me. If you recall, it was said that Deputy Yarin submitted proposals which mostly boil down to restricting the rights of the mass media. This is a misunderstanding. The point is that I submitted to the committee the proposals contained in the letters to me rather than my own proposals. Quite a few of them do not reflect my opinion—it is just that I believed it was necessary to familiarize the Supreme Soviet with all the points of view which have reached me.

As far as my personal evaluation of the draft law is concerned, I would not like to make it categorically and hastily. Besides, I am a layman as far as issues associated with working in the press are concerned. It is, perhaps, preferable for specialists to judge all the intricacies of this matter. However, there are several aspects which, to my mind, should be reflected in the future law.

Let me begin by saying that I would definitely vote for the free press. The times are not yet long gone when the controlled press imposed on us carefully measured information and a uniform point of view on what was happening around us. As a result, we observe very low political standards at present: The people have difficulty receiving unusual ideas and thoughts, are not capable of seeing the rational element in them, and for this reason instinctively reject many useful and intelligent things.

Referring to the free press, I would include in the draft law **the right of a journalist to investigative reporting.** Situations so complex and intricate occur in life that society, to say nothing of the interested parties, cannot arrive at an unambiguous conclusion. In these case, independent investigative reporting could render priceless assistance.

However, all of the above suggests that the Law on the Press should provide for strict penalties for untruthful writings by journalists. You will say that the draft law provides for a fine of up to 50,000. It appears not to be serious to me: Try to find a journalist who has such money at present. Apparently, some other safeguards are needed—I leave this to the discretion of specialists—which guarantee the defense of the honor and dignity of those whom the journalist is writing about. Unfortunately, it does happen in our country, and I know it from my own experience, that you give an interview to a journalist today and do not know what he is going to publish tomorrow. Sometimes they twist your thoughts so badly that later you get tired arguing that you wanted to say something completely different. So, I have to ask: Show me the text before publication, and I will sign it then. This is humiliating both for me and the journalist. The press should have extensive rights and opportunities but the rights of those on whom they report or who cooperate with the press should also be protected by the law.

Finally, there is a point in the draft law against which I will definitely vote in the course of the second reading. I mean the right of an individual citizen to publish mass media.

Can our society at present acknowledge the right of a single individual to own millions or many thousands of rubles which makes it possible to publish one's own newspaper or magazine? I am not referring here to people who have made such money in a legal manner: You would agree that there are few of them, perhaps, several of the very well-known scientists or art personalities. I am a metallurgist with 30 years of tenure; I am considered highly skilled and, by the standards of our country, highly paid employee. However, I have not made that kind of money in all my life. I would not like the funds which private individuals have obtained through illegal means to be used for the further enrichment of these individuals. I believe that we have a right to know which money is going to be invested in new periodicals. Only the monetary reform will allow us to do this: Let the people decide how much money we are going to exchange "ruble for ruble," 20,000 or 30,000, and for the remaining quotas the people will have to submit a declaration. If this is honestly made money let the owner invest it wherever he likes, including in publishing new mass media. However, for as long as clarity on this issue is lacking I will be against this procedure.

On the whole, our country needs the Law on the Press. I believe that voters will make many interesting suggestions during the parliamentary recess, when I meet with them. I would like to have most varied points of view taken into account in the course of the second reading.

Alla Yaroshinskaya, USSR people's deputy:

The Press Is Like Real Life

Finally, the outline of the Law on the Press which has been talked about so much is becoming real. Under the circumstances, we might find the only consolation in the fact that as of now not only our country has no Law on the Press but it does not exist and is not expected to appear in, for example, countries such as England and the United States.

At first site, our situation and theirs are very similar, with just one difference: They already do not have a Law on the Press, and we still do not have it. In England, the press gained freedom still under the Stuarts, and in France under Louis XII and Richelieu. In the United States, the first amendment to the Constitution adopted almost 180 years ago guarantees the freedom of speech and of the press. In 1917, all parties in Russia had their own newspapers independent of the government. The Bolsheviks, who were in opposition, published 17 daily newspapers in April 1917 with a press run of almost 1.5 million. On 27 October, old style—that is, 2 days after the October Revolution—a decree of the Council of People's Commissars on the press was issued. A majority of the bourgeois newspapers were closed by the decree. However, the decree included a qualification: "The present provision is temporary in nature and will be repealed by a special decree once normal conditions for public life are restored." Do you feel how these normal conditions are coming about, and I would say coming about more and more resolutely? For example, a week and a half ago the trial of striking journalists from the Noginsk city newspaper ZNAMYA KOMMUNIZMA was held. Despite the Law on the Resolution of Labor Conflicts containing no references to political strikes they were tried under this very law. However, there was no labor conflict of any kind inside the editorial office. The conflict was of a different nature and hinged on differences between the newspaper and the publisher.

There are many examples of this nature. There are tears shed which the general public does not get to see. In Zhytomir, the talented but undesirable journalist, editor of the Novosti Press Agency in the Zhytomir area Yakov Zayko had his position eliminated because his agency became...unprofitable. For 2 years, he has been trying to ensure the transition to full economic accountability. Incidentally, he wrote to the USSR Union of Journalists and to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Ukraine. They did not let him do that. However, having prevented the person from working normally, as productively as possible, they cut his position. For more than half a year now, he has been virtually unemployed. Indeed, he, a trained editor, was offered a position but that of a reporter—collector of advertisements. This is like offering an artist to water down colors. Similar situations have occurred in Krivoy Rog, in Volyn Oblast, and so forth.

The groundwork for resolving such conflicts on the basis of the law rather than by forcible methods as has been practiced for decades in our country is laid in the proposed draft Law on the Press. I believe that the draft law will make it possible for our long-suffering society to solve one of the main problems—demonopolizing the mass media.

I believe that it is vitally important to definitely retain in the proposed draft law the conceptual provisions signifying the abolition of preliminary censorship. Second, state and public organizations, creative arts unions, religious and other associations of citizens created in keeping with the law, as well as labor collectives and citizens of the USSR, enjoy the right to establish [the mass media]. It is not hard to guess that this wording is the subject of disagreements. However, we should proceed from the interests of a democratic society rather than a society of democratization, and these are somewhat different things. The degree of press freedom reflects the degree of democracy in a society. Among the counterarguments on this point, we get to hear that this contradicts the Vienna accords though actually it is the other way around. This objection is also heard: There will not be enough paper for all. However, the law is adopted for more than a year or two. Disallowing the very opportunity to publish newspapers because there is not enough paper for now is like banning the current production of, say, bad linens because at present there is not enough soap to wash them, or like forbidding women to give birth to children because at present children's clothing is in short supply.

The article of the draft law "The Editorial Board and the Publisher" is the third, conceptual, most principled provision, in particular, the financial status of the editorial board. The boards should definitely have the right to operate under complete economic accountability, and manage their profits after the payment of taxes at the discretion of the labor collective, as any enterprise. At present, many editorial offices generate millions in profits while living from hand to mouth themselves. They go and beg the local authorities for apartments for their employees. Try criticizing a rayon soviet chairman today and going to him tomorrow asking to allocate housing for the journalists! Paradoxical as it is, the fact that the editorial office generates millions in profits for the state means nothing in this instance. In turn, the draft law sets everything right.

Yuriy Shakutin, journalist:

Attention: Amendment!

Let me recall the history of the two Laws on the Press which must have confused the voters who were following the course of debate in the Supreme Soviet. One of them was prepared in the Committee for the Issues of Legislation, Rule of Law, and Legal Order and the Committee for the Issues of Glasnost, Rights, and Appeals by Citizens, and was ready by the beginning of the second session of the Supreme Soviet. The second draft was different from the first in some "revised wordings." It appeared immediately before the discussion at the plenary meeting, and was not approved by either the working group or the committees for the simple reason that they had not seen it. Passions raged on account of the "revised wordings" of the second draft. The supposedly small amendments turned out to be too essential, significant, changing the entire concept of the draft law proposed by the committees.

This is what the deputies stated plainly in their speeches. The revised wordings deprived certain citizens of the USSR of the rights to set up mass media (Article 6), to economic accountability, and consequently, independence of the mass media (Article 4), contractual relations between editorial boards and publishing houses (Article 15), some of the profits (proceeds) generated through the operation of the mass media which could be transferred to the editorial offices and used by them at the discretion of the labor collective. Many editorial offices live from hand to mouth while turning profits going into millions for their parent entities and publishers.

In essence, the "revised wordings" brought to naught Article 1 of the draft of the committees which solemnly proclaimed the inadmissibility of censorship of the mass media. What use is freedom if a version of Article 42 on the relationship of the parent entity and the editorial office is proposed pursuant to which the parent entity and the publisher may forbid the publication of a particular article without being held responsible for this in any way.

I would like to warn all those who wish to take part in discussing the law—pay attention. On occasion, quite insignificant amendments and additional work on the variants of articles in the law change their thrust considerably if not entirely.

Aleksey Kiva, doctor of historical sciences:

Is a "Guiding Hand" Necessary?

Developing the law on glasnost, the press, and the mass media in their entirety is an incredibly complicated task in general, and in particular under our current conditions. After all, we are now at the crossroads of history. We are going through a most complex period of transition to democratic forms of political arrangements, multi-sectoral economy, and we are releasing the latent energy of our society. The situation is equivocal. Could it be otherwise?

Could a law on the press be adopted under the circumstances which would meet the needs of social development at present and in the foreseeable future while being satisfactory for all participants in the political process? Of course not. I believe that something will have to favored given that glasnost and access to the mass media which are the hallmark of a civilized state are at the same time a mighty weapon in the struggle against dictatorships, stagnation, and decay.

However, the very transitional nature of the condition of the public, the unprecedented character of the process of modernization, this peaceful revolution, dictates its conditions whether we like it or not. "The revolution from the top" is steered by the leader of perestroyka and his team, the new power structures which have already emerged in the course of the reform. However, the old structures still exist, and complex processes of the regrouping of forces, of cadre renewal are under way in them.

The issue of the role which the mass media can and should play in the period of transition arises. Should they be equally accessible to all—to the firm adherents of perestroyka and to those wavering, to overtly conservative forces and the extreme radicals? Who is going to head the mass media, and not just in the center but in the republics, oblasts, rayons?

Certainly, it is desirable to take into account the interests of all political currents and social strata of our society with a view of maintaining civil peace and consolidating our society. There are almost 300 million of us, and we are from uniform in our view of the world, our ethnicity, and our culture. It is desirable not to infringe on any political force of society, even more so on an influential one, in the interest of a more even and smooth transition to socialism without social shocks.

Another approach presupposes the primacy of the most significant tasks of perestroyka. The revolution needs its ideological support. In this instance, glasnost has to forget to some degree about its own ends and play a subordinate role—aid revolutionary perestroyka, aid in accomplishing its priority tasks, maybe even at the expense of some restrictions on freedom. Exposing stillborn schemes, utopian projects, antediluvian dogmas, social illusions, false (allegedly socialist) values through the fault of which our people has found itself in the Procrustean bed of totalitarianism—the work on ridding the consciousness of myths is far from over. Old stereotypes interfere with perestroyka greatly.

In other words, someone's "guiding hand" should be felt, and felt clearly, in the course of spiritual emancipation of our society. After all, what is the basis for totalitarianism of any nature? It is spiritual enslavement. As I see it, the instability of the first "thaw" was caused by Stalinism, even if in its renewed form, still being dominant in mass consciousness. The present-day neo-Stalinists still have not laid down their arms. They are splendidly conversant in Marxist phraseology, and they know how to manipulate mass consciousness. They failed to take their revenge in the Nina Andreyeva episode, and a different tactic was resorted to—this time around, scaring people with the advent of capitalism has a great role to play in it.

The balance of forces in our society assumes at times configurations so intricate that on occasion it is not that easy to figure out whether particular actions are to the detriment or to the benefit of perestroyka. Let us look at miners' strikes. On the one hand, this is a mighty means of spurring on the reform. On the other hand, this poses the threat of economic chaos which once again plays into the hands of the opponents of reforms. Let us look at what many people found alarming about the memorable Leningrad meeting—that some party functionaries from among the speakers, as if ignoring the revolutionary changes under way in our society, do not conceal their intention to shelter the party from criticism, from profound changes in the absence of which it will not be able to become a political vanguard of society, its consolidating power. Objectively this means preserving the command-administrative system and the nomenklatura principle of cadre selection which has brought about their deterioration. This, however, is the road to a complete collapse. The claim of the participants in the meeting to represent all of Leningrad, the city of October, which supposedly should set the example of proper behavior during this complex time for other regions is the ultimate shock. What should be done? "Strike a blow at the headquarters?" However, this has already been done...

Meanwhile, some people may perceive the calls for an immediate report or, more precisely, holding the central organs of the party accountable for the course being implemented in the country as a signal. A signal for what? After all, these calls are not issued by the members of informal organizations but by a major and most authoritative party organizations which owns a mighty potential of the mass media.

To my mind, the issue of glasnost, the press, and the mass media should be viewed exactly from the angle of the struggle for perestroyka which is under way in our society. On the one hand, we need to proceed toward the law-governed state, toward respecting everyone's personal opinion, toward—pardon me—not appearing despotic disciplinarians and hicks against the background of the civilized world. On the other hand, restrictions in the name of perestroyka are unavoidable. What is to be done? This is a complicated question, and we will have to look for answers together.

Gennadiy Vychub, associate professor, Department of Journalism, Moscow State University:

The Model Is Pretty. What Next?

As was rightfully noted in the course of the discussion of the draft Law on the Press, in countries which are by far not the least advanced from the point of view of the freedom of information, there are no laws on the press of any kind, nor are they contemplated. A line in the constitution and one or two articles in the criminal code are enough. We may also note that over there there are no laws on economics, but the economy itself does exist and quite well at that.

What I am saying is not at all a reproach to our legislators. It is just that we have to understand that life is amenable to legal regulation only to the degree it is actually ready for this. The entire context of "the debate on the freedom of the press" proves that the demons of the past still hover over our journalism. We have already learned to pronounce the words "multi-party system" without shuddering, but the essentially similar notion of "press freedom" makes some people react instinctively as if to a burn. One of them exclaimed when protesting the opportunity for private individuals to publish newspapers: After all, we cannot surrender to heavens know whom the mighty means of ideological influence. Well, it is not very democratic, but frank it is.

I believe that the Law on the Press will be adopted, even if with cautious amendments. However, at issue are the real circumstances under which this law will apply.

In this matter, it is not enough to adopt a law. A new practice is needed which makes it possible to combine progressive legal norms with an equally progressive structure of the press, radio, and television. If we were to put it in one word, I would call this the anti-monopoly practice. We are approaching the legislative recognition of the multiplicity of property forms; we have almost recognized that in a democratic society there can be no malefactor-dissidents because any opinion (certainly, as long as it does not contravene the law) is public opinion. Realistic steps leading toward democratically designed, varied journalism comprehensively embracing various social interests are on the agenda.

You cannot jump from the realm of necessity to the realm of freedom by a single leap. It is not enough to proclaim freedom, it has to be ensured. It is difficult to attach serious hopes to the alternative press, say, the kind that is sold for a ruble apiece in Pushkin Square. Thus far, it has been serving the narrow circle of its own adherents without contemplating extensive information participation in public life. The argument that we already have secured the freedom of information behavior for our large-circulation press is not convincing either. Indeed, a phenomenon is now possible such as the journal MOLODAYA GVARDIYA, an organ of the VLKSM [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League] Central Committee, which publishes articles of an openly Stalinist nature in almost every issue with somber persistence, including fables, such as in the case with, say, memoirs by Benediktov which he has not written, as it turns out. Not a line can be found in the journal which is in keeping with the perestroyka ideology of the youth organization, the interests and attitudes of the young people. However, one may encounter passages to the effect that "perestroyka is turning more and more openly into the decay of the state, morality, and ethics, with the defense and economic potential being exterminated," that the country is, supposedly, adrift without a helmsman, and this is, supposedly, to the advantage of those who applaud us from across the ocean and the shores of Britain... What can you say to this? We need to have a realistic idea of the driving forces of the process of liberalizing information activities, and at present this means the equivocal, contradictory situation inside the party. The struggle among various currents and groups provides an opportunity (sometimes illusory) for journalism to exist autonomously. What if the party establishes internal unity and sets forth more precisely the right of particular political forces to belong to it? What is to be done then? Should MOLODAYA GVARDIYA or OGONEK be closed?

There are more questions than there are answers which is quite characteristic of a transitional situation. It is important to find real avenues for this transition. The elimination of the party and state monopoly of the mass media is close to being the main avenue. Even now this situation is not in keeping with our view of the role of the party and the methods which it is called upon to use in ensuring its vanguard role. The first step would be to restore party journalism proper and its publications. The existence of a phenomenon such as the [combined] party and soviet press is a contradiction in the context of changes. Let there be various party publications subordinated directly to the party! However, the soviet press itself which reflects the variety of social and political forces represented in the soviets of people's deputies should also be reborn. To be sure, at present this variety is personified only by more than 2,000 people's deputies of the USSR. However, as soon as this spring hundreds of thousands of newly elected local people's deputies will demand the right to communicate with the people freely.

Independent newspapers and magazines, TV and radio broadcast channels are needed. Independent is not to say irresponsible... Judge for yourselves: The command-administrative system has reared journalism in its likeness and after its image. Any cell of this system, down to a factory shop, had its organ, at the very least in the form of a wall newspaper. So, the hierarchy needs to be eliminated, and a different correlation between publications and political structure needs to be found—not through direct subordination but through complicated interaction characteristic of a mature civic society. The activities of independent concerns and associations of journalists and joint-stock companies set up by public organizations, enterprises, and cooperatives may provide the economic and legal prerequisites for this.

I think that only then we will be able to see whether our Law on the Press is working. For now, it is a quite attractive conceptual design, like the ones which our architects submit to international competitions: Look what we can build!

Draft Basic Legislation on Land Published

*90UN0429A Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
6 Dec 89 Second Edition pp 3-4*

[Draft Basic Legislation of the USSR and Union Republics on Land]

[Text] The present basic legislation sets forth legal, economic, and organizational principles for land tenure and is aimed at creating conditions for the rational use of land, maintaining the fertility of the soil, protecting land resources, developing all forms of economic operations on the land on an equal footing, observing their rights and responsibilities by the landowners and the land users, distributing the productive forces optimally throughout the territory, and preserving and improving the natural environment.

Chapter I.

General Provisions

Article 1. Land Legislation of the USSR, Union and Autonomous Republics

Land tenure in the USSR is regulated by the present basic legislation and other acts of the land law of the USSR, union, and autonomous republics issued pursuant to it.

The use of forest reserve land is regulated, along with the present legislation, by the Basic Forest Legislation of the USSR, union, and autonomous republics.

Relationships involving the use and protection of mountain, water, and biological resources are regulated by special legislation of the USSR, union, and autonomous republics.

Article 2. Composition of the USSR Land

All land in the USSR is classified into the following depending on its function:

1) land used for agriculture;

2) land of localities (cities, urban settlements, and rural localities);

3) land of industry, transportation, communications, and other non-agricultural uses;

4) land of environmental-protection, recreational, and health-preservation stocks;

5) land of the forest stock;

6) land of the water stock;

7) reserve land.

Procedures for classifying the land into the categories specified and transferring the land from one category to another are set forth in the legislation of the USSR, union and autonomous republics.

Article 3. Land as Property of the People

Land is the inalienable property of the people residing in a given territory.

Article 4. Land Management

The powers to manage land are exercised by the soviets of people's deputies which allot land parcels to the citizens for lifetime hereditary ownership, use, or lease; to state, cooperative, and public enterprises, offices, and organizations, and in cases envisaged by the law to foreign citizens and organizations for collective ownership, use, or lease.

Purchasing and selling land, giving it as a gift, and exchanging land without authorization is not permitted. Unauthorized seizure of the land and unauthorized management of the land are prosecuted under the law.

Subleasing and other forms of secondary land use are allowed in instances envisaged by the law.

Article 5. Lifetime Hereditary Ownership of Land

Land in the USSR is provided to the citizens for lifetime hereditary use for operating a peasant farm, a personal auxiliary plot, fruit and vegetable gardening, and for meeting other needs.

Article 6. Collective Ownership of Land

The land is allocated for use by:

industrial, transportation, forestry, and other non-agricultural state, cooperative, or other public enterprises, offices, and organizations;

joint enterprises, organizations, and associations with the participation of Soviet and foreign corporate persons created in the territory of the USSR;

religious organizations.

Article 8. Leasing of the Land

Land is leased to citizens, peasant farms, enterprises, organizations, and offices set forth in Articles 6 and 7 of the present Basic Legislation.

Relevant soviets of people's deputies are the lessors of land.

The terms of leasing are determined by the agreement of parties and are specified in the contract. Lease contracts are subject to registration by the relevant soviet of people's deputies.

After the term of the lease of agricultural land expires the lots leased may be transferred to the ownership of the lessees based on the agreement of parties.

State, cooperative, and other agricultural enterprises may assign land to individual employees and lease collectives along the lines of intra-farm lease contracting.

Lease relations are regulated by the legislation of the USSR, union, and autonomous republics.

Article 9. Procedures for Recording the Right to Own and Use Land

The right to own and use land (except for leasing) is certified by a state deed issued by the relevant rural, settlement, city, or rayon soviet of people's deputies.

The format of the state deed and procedures for the registration of a lease contract are set forth in the legislation of union republics.

Article 10. Termination of the Right to Use Land and of Land Leasing

The right to own and to use land, including land leases, is terminated by the soviet of people's deputies completely or in part in the event of:

1) voluntarily giving up a parcel of land;

2) expiration of the term for which the parcel was allotted;

3) elimination of the enterprise, office, organization, or a peasant farm;

4) unsound use of the land parcel or its use in a manner bringing about reductions in soil fertility and a deterioration in the ecological situation;

5) consistent failure to make payments for land before the deadlines set by the legislation of union and autonomous republics, as well as to make lease payments before the deadlines set in the lease contract;

6) failure to use a land parcel allocated for agricultural production in the course of 1 year and of that allocated for non- agricultural production—in the course of 2 years;

7) appropriation of the land in instances specified in the present Basic Legislation.

Article 11. Appropriation of Land

The appropriation of land for state, public, and other needs is performed by virtue of resolutions of rural or other soviets of people's deputies which are entitled to allocate land through procedures set forth in the legislation of the USSR, union and autonomous republics with the consent of the owner or user of the land, and if there is no such consent, by virtue of a court ruling.

The appropriation for non-agricultural uses of irrigated and drained lands, parcels of land occupied by the plantations of perennials, hay-making areas and pasture land on which work for their fundamental improvement has been carried out, land lots of resorts, tree parks, botanical gardens, as well as tracts of land taken up by water-regulation, protective, reserved and other forests of Category 1 (for uses not associated with environmental-protection, recreation, and health-maintenance functions) is practiced only in exceptional cases by a decision of the Supreme Soviet of a union republic with the consent of local councils of people's deputies.

The appropriation of particularly valuable arable land, as well as the land of reserves, national parks, and other protected territories is not allowed.

Enterprises, organizations, and offices interested in the appropriation of land lots have a duty to coordinate the location of the facility site, the approximate size of the compound, and terms of the land transfer ahead of time, before the beginning of the design stage.

The appropriation of land in suburban zones and green belts for state, public, and other needs is allowed only in exceptional cases by a decision of the supreme soviet of a union republic or the supreme soviet of an autonomous republic.

The appropriation of land in the locations of residence and economic activities of small peoples and ethnic groups may be carried out on the basis of the results of a referendum among these peoples and ethnic groups with the consent of the relevant soviet of people's deputies in all cases.

Article 12. Land Fees

Fees are charged for land in the form of rent or other payments set on the basis of the quality and location of the land. In the case of land leasing, lease fees are paid the amount of which is specified in the contract between the parties. Procedures for and the cap on these payments are set forth in the legislation of union and autonomous republics.

The legislation of union and autonomous republics may provide for land fees relief: complete or partial exemptions for a definite period of time, deferment of payments, reductions in the rate of payments.

Nature reserves, wilderness areas, national and tree parks, botanical gardens, as well as experimental farms of agricultural research and educational establishments and general schools in rural areas are exempt from land fees. Other organizations and offices, as well as citizens, may also be exempt from fees on the basis of a resolution by a soviet of people's deputies in keeping with the procedures established by the legislation of union and autonomous republics.

Land fees accrue to the budgets of local soviets of people's deputies, are partially centralized in the budgets of union and autonomous republics, and are primarily allocated for soil conservation, upgrading of the land, and land management.

Article 13. Powers of the Local Soviets of People's Deputies to Regulate Land Tenure

The following are subject to the jurisdiction of local soviets of people's deputies in the sphere of regulating land tenure:

1) management of land within the confines of the territory of local soviets of people's deputies;

2) allocation of land to be owned, used, or leased by enterprises, organizations and offices, peasant farms, and citizens;

3) registration of the right to own land, right to use land, and land leases;

4) organization of maintaining land register records;

5) organization of land management;

6) appropriation of the land in cases provided for by the present Basic Legislation;

7) collection of land fees;

8) monitoring of the use and protection of land.

Local soviets set up commissions of deputies in order to attain these goals.

The distribution of responsibilities among the local soviets of people's deputies of all echelons is determined by the legislation of union and autonomous republics.

Article 14. Powers of Autonomous Oblasts and Autonomous Okrugs in Regulating Land Tenure

The Soviets of People's Deputies of autonomous oblasts and autonomous okrugs manage land within the confines of their territory.

The allocation of land for all-union and republic needs is carried out with the consent of relevant autonomous entities.

Article 15. Powers of Union and Autonomous Republics in Regulating Land Tenure

The following are subject to the jurisdiction of union and autonomous republics in the sphere of regulating land tenure:

1) management of land within the boundaries of the union or autonomous republic for all-republic purposes in coordination with rural, settlement, city, and rayon soviets of people's deputies, as well as the owners and users of land;

2) development and improvement of the land legislation of a union or autonomous republic;

3) establishment of the procedures for and caps on the land fees;

4) development and execution of republic programs for using the land rationally, increasing the fertility of the soil, and protecting land resources in conjunction with other environmental-protection measures jointly with the local soviets,

5) monitoring of the use and protection of land;

6) organization of land management and maintenance of the land register.

Article 16. Powers of the USSR in Regulating Land Tenure

The following are subject to the jurisdiction of the USSR in the sphere of regulating land tenure:

1) management of land for all-union purposes with the consent of interested union and autonomous republics, other autonomous units, as well as land owners and land users;

2) setting forth of the basic provisions for the regulation of land tenure in the USSR, development and improvement of the USSR land legislation;

3) joint development with the union and autonomous republics, adoption, and monitoring of the execution of all-union programs for the rational use of land, improvement of soil fertility, and conservation of land resources;

4) establishment of uniform principles for land fees for all of the USSR;

5) organization of monitoring of the condition, use, and conservation of land;

6) establishment of procedures for maintaining the land register and continuous observation of the condition of land (monitoring);

7) establishment of main provisions for land management.

Chapter II.

Rights and Responsibilities of Land Owners and Land Users

Article 17. Rights and Responsibilities of Landowners

The landowners have a right to:

1) conduct independent economic operations on the land;

2) use the common minerals, peat, forest areas, and bodies of water on the land lot for economic needs in keeping with the established procedures, as well as take advantage of other useful properties of the land;

3) erect housing, production, cultural and service, and other buildings and structures;

4) own the crops planted, plantations of perennial fruit, decorative, and other plants, housing, production, cultural and service, and other buildings and structures;

5) freely dispose of the products obtained;

6) in the event of the appropriation of land receive complete compensation for the investment in increasing the fertility of the soil, as well for accumulating fixed production and non-production assets (in the event of their liquidation).

The landowners have the responsibility to:

1) use the land rationally and efficiently, increase its fertility, use environmentally sound production technologies, and prevent the ecological situation within a territory from deteriorating as a result of their economic operations;

2) restore the fertility of the soil and other useful properties of the land disturbed by them before the deadlines set by the local soviets of people's deputies;

3) pay land fees in a timely manner;

4) observe the rights of other landowners, land users, and lessees.

Article 18. Rights and Responsibilities of Land Users

The land users have a right to:

1) use the land in keeping with its assigned function and conditions for its allocation;

2) use the common minerals, peat, and bodies of water present at the land lot in keeping with the established procedures, as well as take advantage of other useful properties of the land;

3) erect housing, production, cultural and service, and other buildings and structures with the consent of the soviet of people's deputies which has provided the land;

4) receive compensation for the value of land improvements made at their own expense when the use is discontinued.

The land users have the responsibility to:

1) ensure the use of the land in keeping with its assigned function and the conditions set at the time it was provided;

2) use the land provided to them rationally and efficiently, apply environmentally sound production technologies, prevent the ecological situation in a territory from deteriorating as a result of their economic activities;

3) restore the fertility of the soil and other useful properties of the land disturbed by them, compensate for the damage inflicted by them in the course of economic activities, and bear the responsibility for any kind of land deterioration;

4) pay land fees in a timely manner;

5) observe the rights of land owners, other land users, and lessees.

Article 19. Defending the Rights of Landowners and Land Users

Interference by state and economic organs in the operations of landowners and land users is forbidden, except in the cases of violations of the law.

The rights violated are to be restored through the procedures envisaged by the legislation of the USSR, union, and autonomous republics.

Losses caused by infringements on the rights of landowners and land users are to be recouped in full.

Disputes concerning the indemnification for damages are resolved by the courts or state arbitration bodies.

Chapter III.

Land Ownership and Land Use by USSR Citizens

Article 20. Land Ownership by the Citizens of the USSR

Citizens of the USSR have a right to become owners of land lots:

- for operating peasant farms;
- for operating personal auxiliary plots;
- for erecting and servicing a residential building;
- for fruit and vegetable gardening and breeding cattle;
- for individual construction of second homes;
- in the event of acquisition by the residents of cities and settlements of a residential house in a rural area or inheriting such a house.

The legislation of union and autonomous republics may provide for allocating land lots to owners for other purposes as well.

Article 21. Land Use by the Citizens of the USSR

Citizens of the USSR are given the use of the land for hay-making and cattle grazing on the lands administered by the relevant soviet of people's deputies, as well as the lands which are owned or used by enterprises, organizations, and offices.

Article 22. Service-Related Land Grants

Individual categories of employees of transportation, forestry, the timber industry, water management, fisheries, and hunting management, as well as some other sectors of the national economy, are given service-related land grants.

The service-related land grants are provided on land used by the relevant enterprises, organizations, and offices.

A list of persons entitled to service-related land grants, the size of such grants, procedures for allocating and using them are set forth in the legislation of union and autonomous republics.

Chapter IV.

Agricultural Land

Article 23. Allocation of Agricultural Land

Land allocated for the needs of agriculture or assigned for such uses is acknowledged to be agricultural land.

Agricultural land is given to:

1) agricultural enterprises and organizations, peasant farms—for conducting commercial economic operations;

2) research, educational, and other agricultural offices, rural general schools—for research and instructional purposes, propaganda of advanced experience, and agricultural operations;

3) non-agricultural enterprises, organizations and offices, public and religious organizations—for operating auxiliary agricultural facilities;

4) citizens of the USSR and their cooperatives—for operating personal auxiliary plots, individual and collective fruit and vegetable gardening and cattle breeding.

Land lots in hay-making areas and pasture land are allocated for grazing individual cattle and procuring fodder.

In cases specified in the legislation of the USSR, union and autonomous republics, agricultural land may be provided for agricultural operations to joint enterprises, organizations, and associations with the participation of foreign corporate persons, and to foreign corporate persons and citizens.

Article 24. Land Ownership by State, Collective, and Other Agricultural Enterprises, Organizations, and Offices

State, cooperative, and other agricultural enterprises, organizations, and offices are given the land for conducting public agricultural operations and building residential and production structures. Besides, the enterprises, organizations, and offices indicated may rent additional parcels of land for production and non-production uses.

The right of state, cooperative, and other agricultural enterprises, organizations, and offices to the land is preserved when they join agro-industrial associations, combines, agro-companies, and other agro-industrial entities.

Cooperatives which are created on the basis of subdivisions of agricultural enterprises are given land lots by a decision of the soviet of people's deputies on the land they have previously farmed taking the interests of the parties into consideration. These land lots are subject to the withdrawal from the stock of the land of the enterprises indicated. The procedures, conditions, and norms of allocation of the land lots are set forth in the legislation of union and autonomous republics.

Employees of agricultural enterprises who desire to leave them and engage in individual labor activities in agriculture receive for setting up peasant farms land lots withdrawn from the land of the above enterprises by a decision of the soviet of people's deputies which takes the interests of the parties into account. Procedures and conditions for the provision of land lots are determined by the legislation of union and autonomous republics.

Article 25. Land Ownership by Peasant Farms

Citizens of the USSR who have stated their desire to engage in individual labor activities in agriculture based on their personal labor and that of their family members (peasant farms) receive land lots consisting of the field and auxiliary allotments.

Peasant farms which own the land may lease additional land lots for production purposes or rent them out themselves in cases envisaged by the legislation of union and autonomous republics.

Individuals with special agricultural expertise and skills and practical experience of working in agriculture who reside in a given locality enjoy the preferential right to receive land lots.

Restrictions on the size of the land lot of a peasant farm are set by local soviets of people's deputies taking into account regional peculiarities, specialization, and opportunities for the farming of the land provided by the own labor of members of the peasant farm.

The land lots of peasant farms are not subject to allotment.

The land of peasant farms is inherited on terms set forth in the legislation of union and autonomous republics.

The appropriation of the land lot given to a peasant farm for state or public needs may be performed only with the consent of the farm after the soviet of people's deputies allots to it a lot of land of equal value, housing, production, and other structures at the new location are built by the enterprise, office, or organization for which the land lot is allocated instead of those appropriated, and complete indemnification for other losses is made in keeping with the present Basic Legislation.

Chapter V.

Non-Agricultural Land and Reserve Land

Article 26. Land of Localities (Cities, Urban Settlements, and Rural Localities)

All land within the city (settlement) limit is administered by the city (settlement) soviet of people's deputies. Procedures for drawing and revising the city (settlement) limit, the land and economic arrangement of the territory of cities (settlements), appropriation and granting of land lots and conditions for using them are set forth in the present Basic Legislation and the legislation of union and autonomous republics.

The annexation of land lots to the city (settlement) does not entail the discontinuation of the right to own or use these land lots.

When the right of ownership of a structure (building, facility) is transferred on the land of localities the corresponding right of ownership or use of the land lot or a part of it is also transferred through the procedures and on the conditions set in the legislation of union and autonomous republics.

The land of rural localities is administered by the rural soviets of people's deputies. The legal regulation of lands in rural localities is determined by the legislation of union and autonomous republics.

Article 27. Land of Industry, Transportation, Communications, and Other Non-Agricultural Uses

Land given for the use by respective enterprises, organizations, and offices for accomplishing the tasks entrusted to them is acknowledged to be the land of industry, transportation, communications, and other non-agricultural uses.

The size of land lots allotted for the purposes indicated is determined in keeping with the norms and design and technical documentation adopted in keeping with the established procedures, and the allocation of lots is performed taking into account the sequence of their development.

Procedures for the use of the land of industry, transportation, communications, and other non-agricultural uses are set forth in the legislation of the USSR, union and autonomous republic.

Article 28. Land Used for Environmental Protection, Recreation, and Health Maintenance

Land used for environmental protection, recreation, and health maintenance includes the land of nature reserves, national and tree parks, botanical gardens, resorts, and other similar facilities.

Procedures for the use of the above land are set forth in the legislation of the USSR, union and autonomous republics.

Article 29. Land of the Forest Stock

Forested land, as well as that not forested but allocated for the needs of forestry, is recognized to be the land of the forest stock.

Procedures for using the land of the forest stock are set forth in the legislation of the USSR, union and autonomous republics.

Article 30. Land of the Water Stock

Land occupied by bodies of water, hydrotechnical and water management installations, as well as the right-of-way along the banks of the bodies of water, is classified as the land of the water stock.

Procedures for the use of the land of the water stock are set forth in the legislation of the USSR, union and autonomous republics.

Article 31. Reserve Land

All land not transferred to owners and long-term use makes up reserve land.

Reserve land is administered by the soviets of people's deputies and is meant to be allotted for ownership, use, and leasing in keeping with the present Basic Legislation.

Chapter VI.

Compensation for Damages to Landowners and Land Users and Losses in Agricultural and Forestry Production

Article 32. Compensation for Damages to Land Owners and Land Users

Damages caused by the appropriation or temporary use of land lots, as well as restrictions on the rights of landowners or land users or the deterioration of the quality of land in the process of setting up the protective, sanitary, and defensive zones around industrial, transportation, and other facilities are to be fully compensated to the landowners, land users, and lessees who have suffered such losses.

Compensation for damages is paid by enterprises, offices, and organizations to which the land lots appropriated have been allocated, as well as by the enterprises, offices, and organizations the operation of which entails the need to set up protective, sanitary, and defensive zones through procedures set forth in the legislation of union and autonomous republics.

Article 33. Compensation for Losses in Agricultural and Forestry Production

Losses to agricultural and forestry production caused by the appropriation of farmland and the land of the forest stock for uses not associated with farming or forestry operations, restrictions on the rights of landowners and land users, or the deterioration in the quality of land in the process of setting up protective, sanitary, and defensive zones around industrial, transportation, and other facilities are subject to compensation to the soviets of people's deputies. These losses are compensated in addition to the compensation for damages envisaged by Article 32 of the present Basic Legislation.

Indemnities for the above losses are paid by the enterprises, offices, and organizations to which the appropriated farmland and land of the forest stock are allocated for uses not associated with farming or forestry operations, as well as by the enterprises, offices, and organizations around whose facilities protective, sanitary, and defensive zones are set up with farmland and land of the forest stock being withdrawn from use or downgraded to less valuable land.

The funds collected as indemnities are used to develop new land and to increase the fertility of the soil.

The volume and procedures for determining the losses to be compensated are set forth in the legislation of union and autonomous republics.

Chapter VII.

Protection of the Land

Article 34. Goals and Tasks of Protection of the Land

Protection of the land includes a system of organizational economic, legal, engineering and other measures aimed at defending it from plunder, unjustified withdrawals from agricultural use, unsound use, harmful human-generated and natural influences with a view to increasing the efficiency of utilizing nature and creating a favorable ecological situation.

Protection of the land and its rational use are carried out on the basis of a comprehensive approach toward agricultural land as complex natural formations (ecosystems) taking into account their zonal and regional peculiarities.

The character of the system of rational use of nature should be environmentally sound and resource-efficient, and should provide for soil conservation, limitations on the influence on the flora and fauna, geological formations, and other components of the natural environment.

Article 35. Content and Procedures for Land Protection

Protection of the land calls for:

- defending the land from water and wind erosion, mudflows, underflooding, swamp formation, secondary salination, drying, settling, pollution by industrial wastes, and other destructive processes;
- reclaiming disturbed lands, increasing their fertility, and other useful properties;
- removing and preserving the fertile soil layer so as to use it for reclaiming the land or increasing the fertility of arable land the productivity of which is low;
- establishing special use procedures for the lots of land which are significant from the point of view of environmental protection, history, or culture.

All landowners, land users, and lessees, regardless of the forms and length of the use of land, perform work on protecting and improving the quality of the land at their own expense and are held responsible for the deterioration of the ecological situation on their lot of land and adjacent territories which is entailed by their activities.

Land owners, land users, and lessees are entitled to receive remuneration for improving the quality of the land and increasing the fertility of the soil from special funds set up by the soviets of people's deputies and other sources.

Procedures for the protection of land are set forth by the USSR Council of Ministers and the Councils of Ministers of union and autonomous republics.

Chapter VII.

Control Over the Condition, Use and Protection of Land

Article 36. Tasks of Monitoring the Condition, Use, and Protection of the Land

Ensuring compliance by all state, cooperative, and public enterprises, organizations, and offices, as well as citizens, with the requirements of the land law with a view to the efficient use and protection of the land is the main task of state and public control over the condition, use, and protection of the land.

Article 37. Organs Exercising Control Over the Condition, Use and Protection of the Land

Control over the condition, use, and protection of the land is exercised by the soviets of people's deputies, specially established organs reporting to these soviets, and public organizations.

Procedures for exercising control over the condition, use, and protection of the land are set forth in the legislation of the USSR, union and autonomous republics.

Article 38. State Control Over the Condition, Use and Protection of the Land

State control over the condition, use, and protection of the land is organized by the soviets of people's deputies. The USSR Supreme Soviet and the Supreme Soviets of union and autonomous republics set up special organs of land control reporting to them the responsibilities of which include:

1) coordinating activities aimed at controlling the condition, use, and protection of the land;

2) verifying the compliance of decisions made by ministries, departments, landowners, and land users with the all-union and republic legislation and environmental protection requirements;

3) banning activities which violate the land legislation and damage the land;

4) suspending resolutions on land use and commissioning expert studies in cases when carrying out the decisions made may damage the land;

5) press charges in conjunction with violations of the land legislation of the USSR, union and autonomous republics.

Article 39. Public Land Control

Public control of the land is exercised by public organizations. Procedures for exercising control are regulated by the statutes of public organizations.

Article 40. Land Monitoring

Land monitoring amounts to the continuous observation of the condition of the land stock aimed at the timely identification of changes and preventing and eliminating unfavorable processes and trends.

Land monitoring consists of a system of data on the distribution of land among owners and users, productivity of land resources, degradation of soils, and land pollution. Monitoring data are provided to all organs of state and public control.

The structure of monitoring and procedures for carrying it out are established by the USSR Council of Ministers.

Chapter IX.

State Land Register

Article 41. Functions and Tasks of the State Land Register

The function of the state land register is to furnish to the soviets of peoples deputies, as well as landowners, land users, and lessees, information on the condition of the land with a view to organizing its sound use and protection, improving the management of land resources, and providing a basis for the magnitude of land fees.

Article 42. Contents and Procedures for the Maintenance of the State Land Register

The state land register represents a system of necessary and well-grounded data on the legal status of the land, its natural and ecological condition.

The accumulation of these data is ensured by the following subsystems of the state land register:

- registration of land ownership and land uses;
- land records;
- rating of the soil stratum and natural-technical characteristics of the land;
- economic (monetary) valuation of the land.

The state land register is maintained in keeping with a uniform system throughout the country at the expense of funds from the state budget. Procedures for maintaining the register are set forth by the USSR Council of Ministers.

Chapter X.

Land Management

Article 43. Tasks of Land Management

Land management embraces a system of measures aimed at protecting the land and using it rationally, and provides for:

1) performing topographical and geodetic, mapping, soil, geobotanical, and other surveys;

2) developing general charts of utilizing and protecting the land resources of the USSR, union and autonomous republics, the charts of land tenure in oblasts (krays) and administrative regions; compiling drafts associated with the protection and use of the land;

3) developing drafts for establishing new and putting in order existing land uses eliminating in the process the inconvenient location of lands, actual staking of land lots;

4) developing drafts of intrafarm land management for landowners, land users, and lessees;

5) substantiation of siting and field surveys of territories with special environmental-protection, recreation, and reserve regimens.

Article 44. Organization of Land Management

Land management is performed by state land management organizations at the expense of the budget in keeping with procedures set forth in the legislation of union and autonomous republics.

Chapter XI.

Resolution of Land Disputes and Responsibility for Violating the Land Legislation

Article 45. Procedures for Settling Disputes Between Land Owners and Land Users.

Land disputes are settled by local soviets of people's deputies, courts, or state arbitration through procedures set forth in the legislation of union and autonomous republics in whose territory the land of the enterprises, organizations, and offices in question is located.

Disputes involving citizens and associated with land tenure fall within the jurisdiction of the courts.

Disputes involving assets and associated with land tenure are resolved by the courts or state arbitration in keeping with their jurisdiction.

Disputes of enterprises, offices, and organizations of one republic involving the issues of land use in the territory of another republic are considered by commissions made up of the representatives of the interested republics on the principle of parity. If the commission does not arrive at a coordinated decision, the disputes involving these issues are to be considered in keeping with procedures set forth pursuant to the legislation of the USSR.

Article 46. Responsibility for Violating the Land Legislation

Purchases and sales of land lots, their presentation as gifts, and their seizures are invalid. Individuals guilty of committing the above acts, as well as of spoiling agricultural and other lands, polluting them with industrial waste and waste waters, failing to comply with the requirement of environmental-protection regimen of land use, violating the term for returning temporarily occupied land, or failing to meet their obligations to upgrade it to a condition fit for its assigned use, destroying boundary markers of the lines between land use units, distorting the data of state registration, evidence, and assessment of lands, are held accountable under the civil, administrative, or criminal law in keeping with the legislation of the USSR, union and autonomous republics.

Land lots occupied without authorization are returned to the proper owner without defraying the costs incurred during their illegal use.

The legislation of union and autonomous republics may provide for penalties for other types of violations of the land legislation as well.

Chapter XII.

International Treaties

Article 47. International Treaties

If international treaties of the USSR set forth rules other than those contained in the land legislation of the USSR the rules of the international treaty apply.

The same procedure applies to the land legislation of a union republic if an international treaty by the union republic sets forth rules other than those envisaged by the land legislation of this union republic.

Proposals of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for the Issues of Ecology and Rational Utilization of Natural Resources for the draft Basic Legislation of the USSR and Union Republics on Land

Article 5. Land Ownership

Each Soviet family is entitled to receive, free of charge or for a fee, a land allotment as its private property in order to build the house of a size envisaged by the legislation of a union republic. Families which have received land to own from a soviet of people's deputies enjoy the rights and bear the responsibilities of land users envisaged by the relevant articles of the present Basic Legislation.

When land belonging to citizens is bequeathed, sold, bought, and given as a gift the total size of the allotment may not exceed the size established by the law.

MVD Report on Crime Statistics Viewed

PM2011152989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 6

[A. Illesh report under the rubric "Statistics and Our Commentary": "When Did Crime Peak?"]

[Text] 1,988,881—this is the total number of crimes registered by the militia and the public prosecutor's office in the first 10 months of this year. This is an increase of 34.1% over the same period last year. A regular briefing in the USSR Internal Affairs Ministry [MVD] began with the publication of these figures.

How does the militia regard the present situation? It is no secret that the atmosphere in society (largely thanks to glasnost, which has made it possible to extensively publish criminal statistics) is virtually one of panic: Help, there are robbers and murderers everywhere! We will endeavor to listen to the arguments of those whose profession it is to protect us against criminal encroachment.

October did not really bring any changes to the crime picture that has taken shape in the country in recent months. As before, the official press release states, there are a growing number of crimes against personal, state, and public property and also—and this is particularly dangerous, in my view—against citizens' lives and health.

According to the statistics, cities now look like more dangerous places to be than rural areas: 73.7% of crimes are committed in the cities. High growth rates can be seen in so-called "street crime": Streets, yards, parks, and squares are the places where 12.6% of all crimes are committed. There has also been an increase in the number of state transport thefts: an increase of 158%. Unfortunately, the curve of growth in thefts of personal property is also continuing to creep upwards, and there has been just under a 100% increase in burglaries and robbery with violence against citizens.

Who is breaking the law this year, according to the militia's statistics, and under what conditions? Compared to September there has been a drop in the number of crimes committed in aggravating circumstances and in a group (5.8%). Throughout the 10 months as a whole, internal affairs bodies have exposed 1,013,509 people who have committed crimes. Just over 15% of them are women. Less than 5% are between 14 and 15 years of age. Of the total number of criminals caught and arrested, 607,477 (or 59.9%) have had criminal charges brought against them. But 406,032 of them have been released on bail, had their case referred to a comrades' court, or been released for other reasons.

I would now like to draw attention to the figures which, in my view, are particularly significant. I am referring to murder or attempted murder. In the first 10 months of this year a total of 17,412 have been committed. The report says that there has been an increase of 28.4%. There have been 42,462 cases of premeditated serious assault (an increase of 42.4%). Finally, a total of 18,500 rapes and attempted rapes have been committed (or almost 25% more than the same period last year). Terrible? Yes, it certainly is. There is nothing more dangerous than an attempt on a person's life and health. But figures taken individually, torn out of the context of reality, can really do nothing other than frighten people. In my view, A. Gurov, the well-known legal expert and chief of the Fight Against Organized Crime Administration, hit the nail on the head when speaking on television recently (although perhaps his opinions sounded strange to the ear of the ordinary person). He believes that the one murder registered that day in Moscow is perfectly normal for a city with a population of many millions.

On the other hand, rising crime—in this case murder, rape, and so forth—has perhaps now reached an unprecedented level?

I put this question to Major General of the Internal Services A. Smirnov, chief of the USSR MVD Main Information Center. No, the general confessed, serious crime peaked at the end of the seventies and beginning of the eighties. For example, the highest number of cases of premeditated serious assault was in 1979. And the curve of growth in the number of murders reached its highest point in 1980. Then the total number of casualties was more than 20,000.... Even in 1985 (according to data provided by the USSR State Committee For Statistics)

18,700 premeditated murders were committed, compared to 16,700 in 1988. The figures for rape and premeditated serious assault resulting in death are 19,400, compared to 17,700; and 6,900, compared to 5,200, respectively.

Does this mean that the newspapers, which have submerged the reader in an avalanche of facts and figures from criminal statistics and criminal life, are painting the picture blacker than it really is? Perhaps there is no point in the militia so eagerly publishing today what just yesterday would have been considered top-secret information. I think that is a point. Just the knowledge of the true state of affairs will help us decide whether or not we are shouting "help" to no avail. But the rows of figures taken as comparisons are both correct and objective. It is for this reason, and not to prove that yesterday was worse than today, that I now remind you: Until quite recently, against this "peaceful" social background of rape and murder, there were more people in our country maimed by criminals. More than now. But in the minds of some people, the years of stagnation are associated with peaceful times. Drunken times maybe....

My colleagues and I were also intrigued by another entry in the information report presented by the militia. I quote: "The number of crimes registered in the economic sphere has continued to fall during the last 10 months." Surely this must be a mistake? After all, the public is once again firmly convinced that everyone is stealing and that virtually entire sectors of the national economy are being pilfered. Commenting on this phrase, Major General V. Runyshkov, chief of the Main Administration for Combatting the Embezzlement of Socialist Property and Speculation, spoke of flaws in some legal acts, norms, and laws which do not make it possible to bring charges for certain types of "activity." He described crime as the mirror of the state of the economy. I do not think the general was totally accurate in this respect. Crime is more a reflection of how our laws assess various actions in the economic sphere. You must agree, for example, that a case where a person can be sent to prison for 5 or even 10 years for stealing 10 ears of grain harvested in a field cannot be considered a reflection of the state of agriculture. But there has been such a case! Do not think I am drawing direct parallels; I am talking about something else here, about how many of our old notions of what is good and bad, legal and illegal in the economy are changing. And changing rapidly. We should sympathise with the militia.

On the other hand, I fully share the point of view of V. Runyshkov regarding the ration system favored by certain economists. He was asked by a Polish journalist whether the militia is not afraid of an increase in crime in connection with the possibility of a ration system being broadly introduced? To which the general replied (making it clear that this was his own personal opinion): "I certainly am in favor of the market and market relations. They must develop. I am convinced that trade must be liberated and that the Trade Ministry must be stripped of its monopoly in this respect."

A few words in conclusion, with which I must preface an unusual table of statistics. This year 138,008 criminals were on the wanted list. And 99,055 of them have been identified.

And now, part of the table.

Structure of Crimes on Which Cases Have Been Suspended Owing to Failure To Investigate or Ascertain the Perpetrators Liable to Criminal Charges as the Accused.

Type of Crime	Throughout the First 10 Months of		Rate of Growth Against 1988
	1988	1989	
All crimes	327,081	680,008	107.9%
Premeditated Murder and Attempted Murder	1,070	1,741	62.7%
Premeditated Serious Assault	4,613	9,998	116.7%
Rape and Attempted Rape	1,370	2,033	48.4%
Robbery With Violence (Public and Private Property)	2,018	4,889	142.3%

We have not published this gloomy set of statistics as a reproach against the militia. Just look, everyone, at how many unpunished criminals there are (extremely dangerous criminals, at that!) at large in the country. That is certainly not our intention. It seems to me that the above figures clearly illustrate a minimum of two things: The determination of internal affairs bodies to show their true colors even if this does cast them in an unflattering light. Second, the main point: The reality of today is such that the workload of operational investigations subdivisions has risen sharply and they certainly cannot always deal efficiently with their work. This is where the militia needs understanding and assistance from society, both with regard to finances and cadres.

Conference on Organized Crime, Drug Trafficking

LD0812221489 Moscow TASS in English 2149 GMT 8 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 9 TASS—Ways to perfect methods of combatting illegal narcotics trafficking, drug addiction and racketeering in the Soviet Union were discussed at the coordination conference in the USSR Procurator-General's Office.

The conference was attended by the leaders of the Soviet Ministry of Internal Affairs, the State Security Committee, the Ministry of Justice, the chief administration of the State Customs Control, and the Ministry of Health, as well as lawyers.

Participants discussed proposals to improve legislation on combatting illegal drug trafficking and drug addiction, and to step up the struggle against these criminal activities.

The United Nations convention against illicit traffic in narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances, adopted in

December 1988, was signed by the Soviet Union. Nevertheless, speakers stressed, Soviet legislation has not yet been brought into line with that document.

It was also noted that in the Soviet Union only the cultivation of opium poppy and some varieties of hemp are punishable by law. Experience has shown, however, that narcotic drugs can be obtained from any variety of these plants.

The participants were unanimous about the need to considerably enhance material responsibility of people guilty of theft, illicit writing off and losses of narcotic substances.

Customs officials favoured the granting to this service of the rights vested in investigation bodies and the improvement of so-called "controlled deliveries of narcotics."

Operations of this kind have already been performed jointly with customs officials from Great Britain, the Netherlands and Belgium. As a result a big group of criminals was brought to court.

Speakers called for expanding international cooperation between Soviet law-enforcement bodies and their opposite numbers in other countries. The conference supported the proposal unanimously and stressed, in particular, the need to expedite the solution of the question of Soviet entry into Interpol.

The conference also discussed ways to step up the struggle against racketeering. It was stressed that present legislation provides effective tools to combat this, one of the most dangerous kinds of organised crime. These instruments must be skillfully applied.

It was proposed to consider the matter of a special plenum of the USSR Supreme Court. Speakers called for more drastic measures against racketeers.

Turkmenistan's Foreign Affairs Role Examined

90UI0125A Ashkhabad TURKMENSKAYA ISKRA in Russian 2 Nov 89 p 3

[Article by Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Turkmen SSR Councilor First Class A. Rakhmanov: "The Republic Ministry of Foreign Affairs: New Thinking"]

[Text] A legal foundation is necessary in order to work in a new manner. It has been developed since 1988 with tremendous help and understanding from the USSR MFA [Ministry of Foreign Affairs] in the form of "Regulations on the Turkmen SSR [Turkmen Soviet Socialist Republic] MFA." The ministry is responsible for diplomatic, consular, and protocol support for the external contacts of the Turkmen SSR and the coordination of international contacts of republic departments and organizations.

By now, enterprises and associations have been given the right to maintain direct business contacts with foreign partners. In this matter, our help comes in handy. We practice such forms of operations as aid in obtaining the necessary information on foreign enterprises and companies, playing the role of intermediaries in negotiations, consulting on the issues of international law, monitoring of compliance with the treaties signed. During the 3 years of the 5-year plan (1986 through 1988), the average annual volume of export deliveries grew by a factor of more than 2.5.

This, however, is just the beginning. I would like to state some considerations for improving our foreign economic contacts without analyzing in detail the objective and subjective reasons holding back the development of our foreign economic relations.

We need a concept for developing the export potential of the Turkmen SSR, streamlining its imports and foreign economic contacts in general. This task may be accomplished by a specialized subdivision staffed with scientists from the Institute of Economics of the Turkmen SSR Gosplan [State Planning Committee], the Turkmen SSR Academy of Sciences, and branch research establishments. The functions of the Commission for Foreign Economic Relations of the Presidium of the Turkmen SSR Supreme Soviet will apparently change. Previously, it has participated in solving problems arising in the course of export and import operations whereas in the future its functions will definitely include the monitoring of execution by departments and organizations of the decisions of the party and the government on improving the structure, enhancing the quality and competitiveness of goods, and coordination of their efforts with a view to accelerating the socio-economic development of the Turkmen SSR. Incidentally, when the above subdivision is created it may also perform the functions of a working group of the commission (similar to the scientific and economic council of the State Commission for Foreign Economic Relations of the USSR Council of Ministers). Finally, in view of the increasing role of the MFA in developing new forms of cooperation, it is apparently necessary to include our representative on the Commission for Foreign Economic Relations of the presidium of the government of the republic.

The sphere of humanitarian and cultural contacts is undergoing serious changes in the course of perestroyka. Jointly with the departments, creative arts unions, and organizations, the ministry is charged with developing and forwarding to the Administration for Cultural Contacts (UKS) of the USSR MFA on an annual basis proposals for the plan of cultural contacts of the USSR with foreign countries on the selection of eventual participants, as well as the coordination of this work on the whole. The search for and use of original forms of intellectual cooperation, including that based on the cultural heritage of the Turkmen people, will undoubtedly produce the desirable effect.

We should note in particular that the operations of the Turkmen SSR MFA are increasingly becoming regional in nature. The activization of direct contacts between the Turkmen SSR and autonomous regions, provinces, and states of other countries which has recently emerged may and should facilitate accomplishing tasks which are in keeping with the foreign-policy interests of the USSR. In this context, the enhancement of business relations with the general consulates of the People's Republic of Mongolia (1981), Republic of Afghanistan (1982), and India (1987) in Tashkent of whose consular districts our republic is a part becomes important.

The urgent issue of establishing and expanding contacts with Turkmens residing abroad is tied to the peculiarities and conditions in our republic. In this matter, it appears feasible to expand further the rights of the Turkmen SSR in the consular sphere and introduce an additional slot for an employee from the republic foreign-policy department on the staff of consular establishments of the USSR in a number of countries of the Middle and Near East.

Incidentally, the volume of work of the consular service has been increasing progressively; it is being entrusted with still new functions. In particular, last year the amount of processed passport and visa documentation alone increased by a factor of almost 13 compared to 1985. Meanwhile, the service is in need of considerable material and technical facilities. For now, this remains an unsolved problem.

Restructuring is under way in the protocol-political and information and propaganda work of the ministry. We have begun to hold more informal discussion-type events with foreign representatives visiting the republic. There is more openness and less fear of acute issues. The republic chapters of societies of friendship with many foreign countries are being restructured. However, it cannot be said at present that planned and continuous work is under way.

At the same time, the issue of putting in place the real coordination of this activity with a view to avoiding duplication is also present because other departments as well perform such activities to some degree. We plan to entrust this function to the information group at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the republic. It would be feasible to set up a council of experts at the group consisting of diplomats, employees of ideological organizations, economists, historians, sociologists, and literature and art personalities.

The need has become apparent to create in the future a collegium of the republic MFA together with the representatives of establishments and organizations involved in international activities. We also believe that it is important to study and discuss periodically the issues of the status of foreign-policy propaganda in the republic at the meetings of the Ideological Commission of the Central Committee of the Turkmen Communist Party.

Extensive tapping of the scientific resources for developing the line of behavior and communications with adjacent states in the sphere of practical support for cross-border commercial-economic and cultural relations remains an unresolved issue. Life has long shown the necessity of synthesizing the work of diplomats and research associates (despite us not taking this into account in the past). Contacts between the Scientific Coordination Center of the USSR MFA, the Turkmen SSR Academy of Sciences, and some scientists have been established with the assistance of the ministry. Problems and topics have been worked out within the priority spheres for the Turkmen SSR which scientific establishments of the republic have been familiarized with. Issues of new forms of cooperation between the USSR MFA Scientific Coordination Center and the Turkmen SSR MFA on the one side and scientific establishments of the republic on the other side have also been discussed.

Unfortunately, as of now the practical effects of this work are almost nil. The scientists have turned out not to be quite prepared for the bold foreign-policy initiatives which were advanced by the party and the government. An overwhelming majority of scientific studies of the past, and even recent, years are removed from the foreign policy needs of our country. To my mind, the opportunity to tap the scientific potential of the Turkmen SSR in the interest of foreign economic activities will hinge to a decisive degree on the target-oriented use of the available intellectual potential and the pace of training young cadres, as well on creating a formidable Center for Oriental Studies within the Institute of History of the Turkmen SSR Academy of Sciences.

For now, our efforts to reinforce working contacts with both the subdivisions of the USSR MFA (primarily with the Administration for the Countries of the Near East and North Africa, the Information Administration, and the Department of Countries of the Middle East) and Soviet embassies, primarily in Afghanistan, Iran, Iraq, Turkey, and Syria, leave a lot to be desired. Proceeding from the special interests of the Turkmen SSR in these countries, the contacts have to be permanent, they should be developed and enhanced in every way possible embracing an increasing array of issues.

There still are many unused reserves, channels which should be taken advantage of by the diplomats of the republic. For example, until now representatives of the Turkmen SSR have been invited to work in Soviet delegations participating in the meetings of international organization on extremely rare occasions. Not once in its entire history has the republic been represented at the annual sessions of the UNESCO [United Nations Economic and Social Council]. The Turkmen SSR has virtually not participated in the corresponding events sponsored by the UNESCO Science and Technology Regional Bureau for South and Central Asia (city of Delhi, India). Meanwhile, our first practical steps in participating, say, in comprehensive research on the Great Silk Route (within the framework of the World Decade of Cultural Development, 1988 through 1997) show quite convincingly that this sphere of our activities promises to be extensive. This calls for creating a special subdivision for working with the USSR Commission for UNESCO Affairs. We could also take part in the proceedings of the UN ESCAP (Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific) sessions because the raw-material nature of the economy of our republic has certain analogs in some countries of Southeast Asia.

The invigoration of activities of the republic service (and, in a broader context, the participation of the Turkmen SSR in international affairs) calls for solving an entire array of scientific-theoretical, organizational, and material-technical problems. We almost do not have international affairs specialists. The shortage of such specialists is acutely felt especially in the sphere of foreign economic contacts where high-class specialists are needed who are equally knowledgeable about the economy of the republic and the world market, know foreign languages, and are capable of conducting negotiations and finalizing commercial transactions. The same is the case in the sphere of cultural and humanitarian contacts. Specific measures aimed at solving this problem have been developed. A number of important resolutions has been adopted by union and republic organs. However, to our mind, professional centers for training specialists (the Moscow State Institute of International Relations, the USSR MFA Diplomatic Academy, the Academy of the Ministry of Foreign Economic Relations, the Academy of the National Economy) should be used more vigorously. Foreign specialists and their experience should be used in a bolder manner. It is also feasible to consider the issue of introducing special classes on foreign economic relations in the Turkmen SSR economic colleges.

A reasonable augmentation of diplomatic personnel corresponding to the expansion of functions is necessary, Meanwhile, it has so happened that the staff of the republic MFA (assigned at the time when the foreign contacts of the Turkmen SSR were restricted and the very existence of our ministry was largely symbolic) has not only been augmented but... has been reduced by almost a factor of 2. In the course of this, the fact that we are not a ministry of which managerial functions are characteristic has not been taken into account. It is clear that this situation not only leaves us no time for organizing the retraining and professional improvement of diplomats but, most importantly, is an unfavorable influence on the pace of restructuring in the diplomatic service of the republic.

Aganbegyan on Perestroyka, Economy

PY1912183689 Buenos Aires CLARIN in Spanish 14 Dec 89 pp 22, 23, 57

["Highlights" of "exclusive" interview with Soviet Academician Abel Aganbegyan by journalists Enrique Alonso, Pablo Kandel, Daniel Muchinik, and Julio Sevares at the CLARIN offices in Buenos Aires; date not given]

[Text] Economist Abel Aganbegyan, one of the fathers of "perestroyka," or the Soviet state reorganization, is in Argentina carrying out intense academic activities. In this interview he addresses all subjects pertaining to "perestroyka." He also gives personal opinions on other subjects that deserve publication. For example, when asked about his close association with Mikhail Gorbachev, Aganbegyan gave a surprising answer: "Gorbachev is a man who listens very little to economic advisers, and it would be convenient if he paid them a little more attention." Regarding the possible unity of the two Germanies, and contrary to the public's view that the USSR would be the first country to oppose this unity, Aganbegyan said that "it is a German problem." A unified Germany "could perhaps harm the interests of the West, but it would not affect the USSR." He said that the USSR needs West German technology—which is better than that of Japan—for its development.

[Question] Since you are one of the main players in perestroyka, we would like to hear your own version of this process; we have already heard the opinions of skeptical and impartial sources.

[Aganbegyan] Perestroyka is the transformation of the entire Soviet society. It is a vast process; as such, it has been marked by contradictions. It is doing well in the areas of foreign affairs, "glasnost" (unrestricted information), and social democracy. It is also doing well in the difficult but positive area of political reform, in which the people's rights have been expanded.

Perestroyka, however, is not doing well in the economic field. We should consider different sides of the question. Housing construction is not going bad, average life expectancy has increased over the past 2 years due to improvements in the health sector, education is being reformed, and productivity has increased. The process of technological renewal, however, is moving slowly, because only 3% was renewed in 1985 and 10% in 1988.

Perestroyka has done poorly in terms of money circulation, the budget deficit, and the local consumers market, where there is massive liquidity. The money has been drained and it has thus lost its purchasing power, causing inflation and generating social tension. This has produced dissatisfaction among the people.

Inflation and Unemployment

[Question] Inflation and unemployment had been considered nonexistent within the Soviet economy. Does the fact that they have been recognized mean that the foundations of socialism have been questioned?

[Aganbegyan] Inflation and unemployment, although they did exist, were not reflected by our statistical figures, which unfortunately failed to faithfully reflect several processes. Inflation is now higher than in the past. We currently estimate annual inflation at 10%, while in the past it used to reach 4% and 5%. This inflation is not only reflected in price increases, since the Soviet state controls prices, but also in the excess money and the goods that cannot be found in the markets. Unemployment is not a massive problem in our country and our employment rate is high because we include in our statistics students who receive a payment to study. Socialism does not imply an absence of inflation, because any market is subject to inflation to some extent, and it does not imply an absence of unemployment. Structural changes always occur and there are always people who pass from one sector to another and who do not work temporarily.

Accumulation Model

[Question] In capitalist countries, the establishment of a market economy is the result of a historical process. In the USSR, how can you pass from a centralized economic system to one that will allow an increase in consumption and accumulation at its most complex?

[Aganbegyan] We have yet not gone through that process and for the time being it is difficult to say what will happen. To pass from a centralized distribution system to a market system we need three conditions: 1. We need an orderly monetary base to avoid an excess of money. 2. We need well-founded prices, and we therefore need price reform because we want our prices to come close to international or market prices. The state must only regulate the prices of material goods, such as oil. 3. We need to organize the market structure to allow cooperative, private, and leased businesses—in a word, competition. We want to pass to a developed market, not only for articles, but also for money, investments, and notes. We are preparing a law on shares, and we will create a broad capital market and a market of convertible currencies.

[Question] Will you take a monetary path to implement the economic reform?

[Aganbegyan] Not only that; we will also include credits, the state budget and utility rate policy, and the whole system of administrative law.

[Question] Could we say that emphasis has been placed on the monetary policy rather than on the economic reform?

[Aganbegyan] I do not understand the question, because the economy has several structural phases, including the monetary phase, and because we do not regard the monetary policy as something apart from the financial, social, or structural policy.

[Question] In the Soviet economy there is considerable liquidity, while goods are in short supply. The possibility of selling state-owned property to reduce the liquidity, the possibility of borrowing money to import goods, and even the possibility of implementing a rationing policy have been considered. This problem has become increasingly serious. What are the specific immediate steps that will be taken to solve it?

[Aganbegyan] In the next few days the government will propose new measures to the Congress of Deputies. The first thing that must be done is to refrain from wage increases, which have gotten out of control; the Supreme Soviet has already approved a law that restricts wage increases in companies. The second thing is that it has been decided to increase drastically the production of mass consumer goods. We have obtained a $3-billion credit from the FRG, Italy, and other countries to buy equipment for the food industry and light industry. We are giving priority to the transformation of military industries, which we expect to reduce by 19.2% in 2 years. We invested 4 billion rubles to transform military industries into producers of mass consumer goods. We are preparing to increase production of those goods by 10 billion rubles. We also want to increase the interest rate paid on savings accounts, and we want to issue certificates that people can buy and thereby increase the funds available for building houses. We want to sell stock in companies. We are preparing to double imports of consumer goods, but not through new credits, but by reducing other types of imports, such as metal and some kinds of equipment.

Argentina

[Question] You said you came to Argentina to seek new experiences. What experiences?

[Aganbegyan] You know that the first man who climbed Mount Everest, the highest peak in the world, was asked why he climbed it. He answered with a famous phrase: "because Everest exists." Well, since Argentina exists and the country and its economy are interesting, and since I as an economist was given the opportunity to visit it, I consider it interesting and important to learn more. From an economist's point of view Argentina is very interesting, since the Keynes theory was applied here for some time, after which the Chicago School theory prevailed. The results of both theories can easily be seen.

[Question] What are the possible economic repercussions of frictions within the Baltic countries, the Ukraine, Azerbaijan, and other Soviet regions?

[Aganbegyan] We used to have an old model of order and command, when everything was decided in a centralized government. This had a negative effect and became critical in the republics. That is why the model of autonomous confederated republics was adopted, and broad rights were given to regions within Russia and the Ukraine.

I support this model in all its forms. The Baltic Republics were the first ones to make concrete proposals to attain this autonomy, and they, together with Belorussia, will also be the first ones to adopt a different economic system, as of 1 January 1990. Other republics are preparing for this, taking their own characteristics into account, and they will adopt the new economic system on 1 January 1991. The main request of these republics is that the USSR guarantee them the supply of gas, electricity, metals, and other basic products. The USSR has guaranteed this, and in exchange the republics will give the USSR consumer goods, meat, and machinery they produce.

Administrative crisis

[Question] Soviet economists held a seminar in Buenos Aires last year. They arrived at the conclusion that the economic reforms are not enough if they do not guarantee an improvement in the administrative mechanisms. Now the government departments do not obey the ministries, company managers do not obey the departments, and the workers do not obey the company managers. The economists think that if the administrative anarchy is not solved, the economic reforms will be senseless.

[Aganbegyan] The problem is real, and in a democratic transition, different people naturally resort to such alternatives. Along with the flood there is much foam. These facts are true to a large extent. Of course order is needed, and that order must be brought out of the chaos. If a person does not work well, he must earn little or simply be dismissed. If a manager does not do his job, he must be removed. We are gradually moving that way—perhaps not too firmly, since in order to allow democracy and "glasnost" to work, one must be soft for some time.

Market economy

[Question] How can these objectives be met, in light of the poor quality of Soviet products and the drop of productivity in the USSR?

[Aganbegyan] It is a consequence of the incorrect economic system that we applied for many years. Our economy was and will continue to be poor as long as it is affected by factors that are foreign to the market. Under these conditions we cannot improve quality, because no one buys if things are not sold. Consumers have no options. That is why we now want to move to another system, to the market economy, where production works according to the consumers' demands. If consumers do not like something being produced, it is simply not bought.

[Question] How long will these changes take?

[Aganbegyan] Not everything is possible. One cannot progress too quickly and be in the vanguard of all kinds of production. We are trying to attain an open economic system, to join the international market, and to apply the division of labor.

[Question] What possibilities are there for the USSR to join the GATT and the IMF?

[Aganbegyan] These are two different subjects. We wanted to join the GATT, at least as observers, but the United States has opposed this. We have made some progress since the Gorbachev-Bush talks in Malta, and we are now preparing to comply with some of the GATT conditions. However, one-third of the GATT member countries do not meet the conditions required, and the United States notes the need for compliance only in the case of the USSR. Now, there is divided opinion in the USSR regarding the IMF and World Bank. Some people think we should join them and others do not. I favor joining them. Those who oppose that position say that we must contribute $2.5 billion, and no one knows what benefits it could bring us. This is a difficult subject in times of foreign currency shortage. however, despite the fact that we cannot immediately join these organizations, we should nonetheless increase our cooperation with them.

[Question] How can the political developments of Eastern Europe affect CEMA?

[Aganbegyan] CEMA will continue existing because the Eastern European countries need to sell their products in the USSR in exchange for oil and other Soviet products. In time, the USSR will be able to buy from the West many of the products it is now buying from Eastern Europe. The USSR prefers, however, to continue buying from Eastern European countries for reasons of mutual convenience.

Commission Member Views Special Privileges

90UN0461A Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY
No 49, 9 Dec 89-15 Dec 89 p 5

[Report on interview with Academician V. Ginzburg, by ARGUMENTY I FAKTY correspondent A. Uglanov: "Privileges—by Merit" under the rubric "10 Billion Personal Cars a Year"]

[Text] The editors continue to report about benefits and privileges. Today our correspondent A. Uglanov converses with V. Ginzburg, USSR people's deputy and member of the USSR Supreme Soviet commission on privileges.

[Uglanov] Vitaliy Lazarevich, after long and animated discussions, black Volgas with bored drivers have not become a museum rarity. It is known that you are conducting work in the commission just along this line.

[Ginzburg] Yes and I want to say at once that this is far from a simple problem because there are privileges which are fully legal, and even, in a certain sense, unavoidable.

This applies also to personal cars. There are categories of people who must have them. But also in this case it is justified only if the car does not stand by idly for hours.

I was told that occasionally personal drivers simply get drunk because of having nothing to do for hours, days, months.... A person can become degraded from that.

[Uglanov] Your commission, I would say, is most famous, judging by its assigned task. Does your work move easily?

[Ginzburg] Not in everything. A part of the deputies-members of the the Supreme Soviet are rather busy. Another problem is receiving answers to our inquiries.

[Uglanov] How much does an official car and its utilization cost?

[Ginzburg] The cost consists of the following components: driver's pay for working one shift—minimum R200, i.e. R2,400 per year. Then garaging, overhead, etc. Then cost of fuel, and finally, the cost of the car. Considering that a car is used, say, for 10 years, the cost of its use for a year is R8,000 to R10,000, or for a month, R700 to R800.

[Uglanov] And how many official light passenger cars are there in the country?

[Ginzburg] I cannot say exactly, but about 1 million. Multiply that by R10,000 and you get R10 billion per year. I do not think that a large savings is possible here, about 10%, but even that is already R1 billion.

[Uglanov] But there was already a decree of the USSR Council of Ministers of 23 January 1988 about reducing the official vehicle pool by 40%.

[Ginzburg] I do not know to what extent this decree is being carried out, and I doubt its correctness because "reduced" cars were sold to someone, and business trips, no matter what one says, are necessary. Therefore taking this approach is impermissible. Remember the fight against alcoholism when vineyards were chopped down. The largest reduction must be in personal cars. This is what working people are writing about.

Vehicles which are called from a motor pool for a definite time and location must become the basis of transport. For some trips the user probably will have to pay. I mean nonduty trips.

Therefore, as you see, we do not aim at leveling.

[Uglanov] It is known that a pay increase for government and party workers took place recently. Did this event enter into the purview of your committee? [Ginzburg] I think that those who lost a whole row of privileges could get monetary compensation.

One should not see anything wrong in it, because earlier pay rates of different categories of citizens did not differ that much from each other, but special privileges were given for more responsible work. With the withdrawal of a series of privileges the difference in work should be compensated financially, as is customary in the entire world.

[Uglanov] How many individual pensioners are there in the country?

[Ginzburg] Our commission used the figure 600,000 persons.

[Uglanov] How do you feel about many important government and party workers from the whole country showing up in Moscow in magnificent apartments and on full allowances after going on pension?

[Ginzburg] This is an abnormal manifestation, but I want to tell you that we did not discuss this problem. We do not have a staff (only one coworker) and we do not examine personal matters. The commission occupies itself only with government institutions. There is an opinion that it is inappropriate for us to concern ourselves with privileges at public institutions. I do not consider that right, because party and government staffs have grown together to a significant extent. We do not examine the situation in other public organizations, which is also wrong.

Writer Bemoans 'Deculturalization' of People

PM1912101389 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 16 Dec 89 First Edition p 4

["Viewpoint" article by Ernst Mikhaylov, RSFSR honored cultural official: "What Is Beyond the 'Red Line'?"]

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] Memory is a moral category. In our "interesting era" it has become a political category.

But is this not the stance of the apology for treachery presented by D. Granin's tale "The Bison"? As is well known, in 1988-1989 the Main Military Prosecutor's Office conducted a supplementary inquiry into the case of N. Timofeyev-Resovskiy, who was convicted of treason in 1946. It found that he had "carried out studies linked with improving the military might of fascist Germany, which was waging all-out war against the Soviet Union." Conclusion: The one volume produced by the 1946 inquiry became 10 volumes following the supplementary inquiry.

Is this individual destined to be one of our national heroes? Do people want his name to replace the names of the heroes of Brest and Stalingrad?

Does this "refocusing" not result in fascists wandering around the streets of our cities in the 45th year after the Victory? The phrase Soviet fascist is an unlikely one. A Soviet fascist in Leningrad is even more unlikely. There where the waves of the Neva lap the sides of the "Aurora," where an eternal lament hangs over the Piskarevskoye Cemetery. "No one is forgotten, nothing is forgotten." Nothing is forgotten?

I am ashamed to face you, Tanya Savicheva, my Leningrad contemporary. I remember first reading your diary in a museum: "The Savichevs died. Everyone died. Tanya alone remained." I remember my chin trembling agonizingly, hiding my red eyes, while considerate Leningraders passed me by, realizing that guys do not like people seeing them cry. I am ashamed, Tanya, that the spidery shadow of the swastika—our own home-bred swastika—rose over our land. Please forgive....

But these are still illegal. On the other hand the League of Zionists has been operating openly in our country this year. A League of Zionists in a country which voted in favor of adopting UN General Assembly Resolution No 3379, which said outright that "Zionism constitutes a threat to international peace and security and a form of racism and racial discrimination." In a country where racism is prohibited by the Fundamental Law....

I grew up in an army environment, an international environment. I regard talk of "God's chosen" nation and the slogans used by contemporary "pogromists" as equally unacceptable. I definitely disagree with those people who see a desire for some "self-isolation" in the organization of national cultural societies, centers for the study of native languages, theaters, ensembles, and literary associations for those people who live outside or do not have their own national territories. However, one cannot help but note that there are people in the country who have given themselves the sole right to speak and act on behalf of their entire people, including those who try to put anti-Zionism and anti-Semitism on an equal footing.

Is that not why when a B'nai B'rith delegation visited the USSR for the first time its "package" for Soviet officials' examination included the demand that the "Jewish anti-Zionist committee be disbanded"—that is how they describe the Anti-Zionist Committee of the Soviet Public. Disbanded—that'll do!

I feel aggrieved, so to speak, for the state: Have we not somehow grown accustomed to people addressing us in that tone.

However, is it not the state itself that permits this? From the platform of the First Congress and the USSR Supreme Soviet we heard a lot of people saying things about it that would have had a man carted off to the militia for shocking behavior if they had been said elsewhere. "Social nationalism," "social imperialism," "social chauvinism," "colonizers"—need I go on? I saw a cutting from a Georgian newspaper today showing a three-headed dragon, one head Hitler, the other Stalin, and the middle one Gorbachev. That is what is described as "pluralism" in our country (first it was "socialist pluralism," then the word "socialist" got lost somewhere). The Soviet flag was burned amid whistles and catcalls, along with a Soviet soldier's uniform. Then the royal Romanian flag under which Hitler's Romanian accomplices went to Odessa was brought out in Kishinev. How can its heroic defenders—including Moldavians —sleep easy in their graves!

My father had a younger brother, who was so young that we did not call him uncle but Pavlik. After 2 years of war he became a captain, having started off as a Red Army man. I found out how Pavel died many years after the victory. A reconnaissance group fell into the hands of Banderites. Four barrels of corpses chopped into little pieces with feet, hands, and heads on top were all that was left of the guys. One of my father's former colleagues, who was acquainted with his brothers, recognized Pavlik's head in one of them.

Good people, pluralists, teach me, a sinner, how I should now treat the "yellow and blue banner" and the "tridents" which we have as relics these days of the Banderite "Mazepa-style hordes"? People try to "console" us with historical memory, but recent memories are still an open wound!

The Estonian professor T. Made, USSR people's deputy, during his notorious interview in Sweden's SVENSKA DAGBLADET, spoke about his notion of the Russian people. They have a "masochistic streak" and "display aggressiveness and violence even in love. Love and pleasure come after violating women." "I can never," the professor regrets, "make (!) them understand that Estonia belongs to the Estonians, who must therefore have the right to the deciding vote. Everyone else must be considered to have the right to a consultative vote."

But the book "Empire at the Crossroads" (according to T. Made, the "empire" is, naturally, Russia) just published by Finland's Kirjajuhtomia Publishing House compounds these insinuations with the following definitions of Russians: "speculators," people "who are only ready to take," a people who have lost "their natural characteristics." In a special chapter the professor unburdens his heart about our Armed Forces: "The Asiatic-Stalinist slave mentality is flourishing well in the Soviet Army." Well, the USSR people's deputy is quite consistent in his stance.

Yes, but I, a Slav, have already at one time been proclaimed a second-class person and of inferior race....

That is the trouble: If Professor Made were to insult me personally, I could, so to speak, answer him. But a whole people can be insulted with impunity. Especially since this gentleman enjoys the right of parliamentary immunity. And, it must be said, makes extensive use of it. And he is not the only one.

But such sentiments cannot exist on their own: Willy-nilly attacks on Russia, its history, and culture are beginning to go hand in hand with a denial of socialist values. We have encountered this phenomenon on several occasions. Writer V. Belov was not "overdoing it" at all when he said the following at a Supreme Soviet sitting: "It seems that some deputies do not tolerate any democracy apart from U.S.-style democracy. At the session we have already created the syndrome whereby we borrow, imitate, and admire everything foreign, which among the Russian people is described as 'xenophilia.'"

Yet it would not have been a bad thing for us in this case to listen to reasonable Americans, who frequently warned us: Do not jump headlong into Western experience, we have different conditions, different traditions, and a different social system, and, lastly, everything is not so lovely in our garden. No, there is no holding some people; having failed to grasp their own problems, they compound them with plenty of borrowed problems.

"Xenophilia" has swamped us so that soon we will forget our own language and the words "consensus," "alternative," and "socius" will be heard. If we find it painful to talk about the process of "depeasantization" can we really not see how the process of the people's deculturalization has escalated and how their moral values are under attack?

Prostitutes rival movie stars for popularity, a powerful wave in defense of homosexuals is sweeping the press. The All-Union Lenin Communist Youth League [Komsomol] has embarked most actively on restructuring young people's social consciousness and has achieved splendid successes: Whole organizations are leaving it and video salons, where films are "shown" which are by no means compatible with the ideals that should be defended and propagated by the Communist (!) Youth League, although designed for the "Komsomol" age group, are flourishing.

During the years of the greatest hardships the country wrote and sang songs. They represented both a rallying point and a lifeline for people. Their words were copied and sent home in front-line "triangular envelopes." We do not have mass singing today. A "fatal" tumor has supplanted it for us. Emil Gilels proudly showed me photographs of a piano on an open-top lorry, himself wearing an overcoat and fingerless gloves, and soldiers standing around in frosty greatcoats and sheepskins. During the Leningrad blockade the premiere of the [Shostakovich] Seventh Symphony was relayed by radio into the trenches, while the shells issued to the artillerymen in succession were that day used up on a counterbattery strike to ensure that the fascists did not spoil the concert.

However, all that is well known.

Something else is unknown: Whose ill-will is responsible for our art being sold out to economic accountability and ceasing to be a matter of state importance. Why do we not need Tchaikovsky, Glinka, Strauss, and Beethoven? How have we reached a point where talented musicians leave the country—not for political reasons but because their talent is unwanted.

Our borders are wide open to mass culture of all shapes, forms, and hues. Hence, the theater, music, and cinema are all cracking up under its elephantine tread. Incidentally, the Americans, French, Germans, and others themselves prefer to listen to Spivakov, Tretyakov, and Svetlanov.

Deculturalization is the cause of many of the country's troubles. A setup of primitive simplicity. The peoples' culture cannot withstand the struggle against the import of mass culture. But who is importing and circulating it? Officials from Moscow. But Moscow is the capital of the USSR and also the capital of Russia. And so there is another myth about "Russian expansion" ready for you here—this time in the cultural field.

The country is being lacerated by ethnic clashes. But total deculturalization is also in many respects the reason for this. A man of culture will not vilify a whole people as Professor Made does. A man of culture will not lift his hand against his neighbor just because he is of a different nationality and has different beliefs. But a vandal will. Vandalism is becoming the sign of the times. In Old Russia such times were called "troubled."

And they were always followed by interlopers. Some with a purse, some—with a sword.

I was born in a garrison. I have spent 25 years in military journalism. I hope that people in army uniform will also see me off on my last journey. "Indestructible and legendary...."

But legends grow up over a long time and are debunked rapidly, as it turns out. Boys are now more familiar with old man Makhno than Shchors or Lazo. Commanders and political workers shrug their shoulders: Why should we raise a soldier on Chonkin's example [character in novel by V. Voinovich]?

Ales Adamovich exclaimed pathetically to the whole world: "We have won!" Speaking in defense of his comrades in arms—the "Afghan" officers accused of fratricide—Sergey Chervonopiskiy was pilloried in the press, on television, and even in the poetical exercises of his Supreme Soviet colleague. A general —a republic military commissar—was beaten up in Armenia. They are similar phenomena.

KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA recently issued its readers with an ominous warning—the officers are muttering, and bear in mind the fact that the Army is different from the miners in that it has weapons. They are trying to present the Armed Forces—and not for the first time—as some kind of "anti-perestroyka" reactionary force prepared to go to any extremes.

Are participants in the All-Army Officers Conference right when they say that the kindling of anti-Army sentiments and attempts to drive a wedge between the Army and the people are the handiwork of those who do not like Army Communists' clear-cut stance and the Army's devotion to Soviet power—as perceived by V.I. Lenin.

Incidentally, can we and should we revive the former Red Army response—"I serve the working people"—to replace today's abstract formal response—"I serve the Soviet Union"—in view of the direction from which the attack is being made? That is more accurate now.

Let this be a reminder to those who are trying to disarm (not reduce arms to the level of reasonable sufficiency but disarm) the country: Our Army was, is, and will remain the people's army. The people built it and the people are its supreme judge.

There is the concept of entropy. A measure of the uncertainty of a situation, a measure of the internal disorder of a process. I believe that our state is now in a position of ever-increasing entropy today: We have come extremely close to the point indicated on instruments with a "red line" beyond which it is dangerous to proceed.

Beyond this line the USSR's integrity and the party's integrity may be destroyed.

The people have accepted and supported perestroyka and are actively involved in it. But they have perceived it as a creative and constructive force, as as chance of making progress, once we have cleared ourselves of the scum and rust.

The destructive position defined by the saying "to destroy is not to create, you don't give a damn" is an antipopular stance—and thousands of deceived pickets and soapbox orators still do not represent the people, however much political intriguers who have donned the guise of "perestroykers" may speculate in the people's name.

The entire country is now looking to the Kremlin, to its people's deputies, who have assembled for the Second Congress. People expect well-considered decisions, full realization of responsibility, and a determined turn to the future rather than ostentatious speeches and splendid poses in front of the cameras, since we have had enough of them and must no longer try to advance while looking backwards.

Certainly, we are living in an interesting era. But we ourselves created it. It must be channeled in our common interests.

Influenza Epidemic Hits Moscow, Other Cities

PM1912175989 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 17 Dec 89 First Edition p 4

[Unattributed report: "'Imported' Flu"]

[Text] It was reported at a news conference held at the USSR Ministry of Health that, according to figures received from the World Health Organization and national influenza centers, a rise in the incidence of flu is currently being observed in Britain.

In the USSR right now an increase in the incidence of the illness above the epidemic threshold is being recorded in Moscow, Ufa, and Smolensk—by 10%, and in Voronezh and Minsk—by 25%.

For example, in Moscow 11 December 35,800 cases of flu and acute respiratory illnesses were recorded (the epidemic threshold for the capital is 30,000 cases per day).

O. Volkov, first deputy general director of the "Soyuzformatsiya" All-Union Association, said that domestic industry currently provides the population with only 42% of medicaments. An allocation of 500 million foreign currency rubles has been made for the purchase of medicines abroad.

Economic

Report on Moscow Railmen's Conference

PM1212170189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 7 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 3

[Report by V. Romanyuk: "Railroad Workers' Conference: Thirty Years On"]

[Excerpts] The country's railroad workers have gathered in Moscow after a 30-year break in order to discuss measures to improve their work and accelerate the socioeconomic development of railroad transport in conditions of perestroyka.

The events which took place in the transportation sector last summer demonstrated yet again how great is the transport workers' role in the functioning of the entire national economy. The slightest stoppage on one of the roads and entire sectors are paralyzed. It is sometimes an extremely complicated matter to correct the situation.

Addressing the conference, N. Ryzhkov, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, emphasized that transportation was, is, and will remain a key sector of the national economy which must be shown constant attention and concern. [passage omitted summarizing Ryzhkov speech]

Interethnic conflicts have literally derailed the sector. In Azerbaijan alone the movement of all trains was halted on three occasions. The latest week of idleness was 27 November through 6 December. The shipment of 50 million tonnes of freight was disrupted. On a countrywide basis the contents of abandoned freightcars mean that some R800 million worth of material values are excluded from circulation in any 24 hours. Direct losses as a result of strikes by transport workers and interethnic conflicts have amounted to R0.5 billion. This year, of the planned freight volumes, 20-30 million tonnes will not be dispatched, while balance sheet profits will be R300 million below the plan figure. Whereas in the three preceding years labor productivity rose by 19.5%, this year—according to preliminary indications—it will rise by just 0.2% in all.

Actions aimed at destabilizing the situation in the transportation sector were condemned at the All-Union Conference of Rairoad Workers. Hero of Socialist Labor A. Balginbekov, rolling stock assembler on the Alma-Ata Railroad, voiced the opinion of his colleagues when he demanded the institution of proceedings against transportation sector saboteurs. The speakers also posed questions which have long been awaiting resolution. In terms of the level of their wages railroad workers are today in 23d place out of the 33 basic sectors of the national economy.

Some 428 demands were put forward at the meeting in July between representatives of the trade unions and the technical advisory service and leading officials of the

Railways Ministry. Many of these demands have been implemented. The 1990 budget allocates an additional R850 million for the satisfaction of the railroad workers' social needs. Also included are additional payments for nighttime and evening shifts, wage supplements for subway workers in Ural and Siberian regions, and other items.

A total of R27.5 billion has been appropriated for the sector's development over the last 4 years. Much work has been done on network automation; 2,600 km of second track have been commissioned. Today it must be a question of ensuring that the investment produces an immediate return. Meanwhile, many problems are being overcome only slowly. Fifteen of the 32 roads are failing to fulfill their plans. The results for 11 months of the year indicate that railroad workers are to blame for consumers failing to receive 7 million tonnes of petroleum and petroleum products, 9 million tonnes of coal, and a vast quantity of metal, ore, and fertilizers. Many enterprises have been unable to build up their normative winter stocks of fuel.

Among the most important tasks on whose solution the sector's leaders must work Minister N. Konarev singled out the following: Support for any transportation initiative, better labor incentives, and concern for the general conditions experienced by railroad workers; the fight to increase freight shipments per unit of capacity, accelerating freightcar turnaround by a minimum of 5-7%, and increasing average train weight by 100 tonnes.

"Increasing the weight of trains," the minister declared, "is a reserve to which there is no alternative in conditions whereby the railroads' throughput capacity must increase while resources for the development of the network remain limited."

The example set by innovators is particularly great in this situation. The transportation workers of the Belorussian Railroad, whose experience ought to, but has not yet, become the property of the entire sector, achieved a substantial increase in productivity by introducing the achievements of scientific and technical progress, improving the organization of production, and strengthening order and discipline. The wages of workers in the basic jobs were increased following a reduction in manpower numbers: Locomotive engineers—by R64 a month, tracklayers—by R48 a month, traffic controllers—by R47 a month, rolling stock assemblers—by R43 a month. There has been an overall reduction in manpower of almost 20%, along with a comparable rise in productivity. There has been a simultaneous decline in the number of accidents and in the volume of poor workmanship in general.

Useful experience has been accumulated by the collective of the Northern Railroad, where they have developed and introduced a comprehensive intensive freight shipment technology which ensures a stably high dispatching and throughput capacity [provodnaya i propusknaya sposobnost] for the lines and makes the best possible use of the freightcars' holding and carrying capacity.

Who among us has not experienced for himself the defects in the transportation service, who has not grumbled about the cold passenger cars, the weak tea, and suchlike. The lease contract system on the railways is sharply changing the situation. For instance, the team operating the "Moldova" passenger express has created a truly comfortable train by switching to lease contract.

The forthcoming decade will require an enormous amount of money—approximately R150 billion—in order to ensure the progressive development of railroad transport. But the budget will not stand this. How do we get around the problem? Minister N. Konarev sees the answer in liquidating the unprofitability of transportation and of certain types of freight shipments. For example, suburban line fares have not been looked at for very many years, and now it only costs 1 kopek for a 12-km train ride. Or take the subway: In Moscow the cost of a single passenger journey is 5.6 kopeks; in Yerevan it is 27 kopeks. But a flat-rate fare of five kopeks is in force in all cities. Long-distance train journeys cost the passenger no more than a bottle of good wine. It is proposed to increase freight shipment charges by 90% and passenger fares by 40%. This is clearly an unpopular measure, but it would provide R125 billion and practically ensure the self-financing of railroad transport.

A blatant miscalculation has been committed during the reform of the economic mechanism: The principles introduced into industry have been applied to transporation virtually unchanged. It has not been taken into account that the economic accountability interests of the enterprise and the state frequently diverge. Economic accountability's orientation toward earning a profit immediately divides freight into "advantageous" and "disadvantageous." Let us admit it: It's more advantageous to carry waste paper than grain or defense-sector freight. Economic accountability dicates: Carry the waste paper, the grain can wait!

The task consists in flexibly combining the centralized management system with increased enterprise autonomy. In the minister's opinion, the sector has achieved the optimal correlation of management and production personnel. Today the management apparatus comprises 8.7% of the sector, while for the national economy as a whole this figure is 12-14%. The minister spoke against the proposal to eliminate the railroad departments. He believes that the railroad departments must remain insofar as they bear the main burden of the organization of freight shipments, and their role is increasing in conditions of the development of territorial economic accountability. However, he agreed that it is necessary to pursue the amalgamation of the railroads themselves. [passage omitted]

I. Silayev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and the leaders of a number of central departments took part in the work of the conference.

The conference will last four days. We will inform readers of its results and the decisions adopted.

Goods Continue To Clog Estonian Ports, Rails

904H0049C Moscow GUDOK in Russian
1 Nov 89 p 1

[Article by GUDOK correspondent L. Lyubimov, Tallinn: "It is Time to Change More Than the Sign"]

[Text] Unfortunately, the ports of Estonia have been gripped by the same "epidemic" as other maritime gateways of our country. In the Tallinn Port alone, 20,000 tons of general cargo are awaiting shipment. They include paper, pulp, zinc, tin, polyethylene, and many other items. Recently, a ship carrying 2,500 tons of cocoa pods arrived. Statistics on the New Tallinn port are even more impressive. At the local elevator, 191,000 tons of grain await shipment; there are over 4,000 tons of butter at the warehouses. Vessels carrying potatoes, bananas, and apples are approaching....

...Seamen, railroad employees, highway transportation personnel, and representatives of foreign trade—people working in related branches—gathered for the coordination council of the junction. The situation is alarming. It is exacerbated by uncertainty—the plan which they tried to discuss is rather a token plan. There is a shortage of gasoline for highway transportation. Unloading mechanisms at the station of Tallinn are out of order. The seamen have too much imported freight on hand due to the failure to furnish the requested number of cars; in their turn, railroad employees have no good news for them concerning the future.

Deputy Chief of the Port of Tallinn B. Popov stated that it will be necessary to provide 30 boxcars daily for imported general freight next week. From the point of view of technology, the port cannot manage more than that. However, Chief of the Station of Tallinn V. Mezherenko promised to provide only one-half of the amount requested, and even that provided that the division does not request to dispatch cars to the section for loading potatoes which Estonia is shipping to Leningrad and other industrial cities of Russia.

At present, there is a shortage of boxcars not only here, but on the entire Baltic Railroad. It is no accident that freight has been awaiting shipment at the ports of Tallinn since September. The MPS [Ministry of Railways] responds to requests to send some more empty cars by saying: "You must be grateful for us not taking them from you!" There is a shortage of boxcars this year throughout the country. A great many of them were held in Azerbaijan, in that same Estonia, in Moldavia.... They are right at the ministry: There is one way out of this—to unload and turn the cars around faster in the field.

At the same Tallinn Junction, it takes a long time to unload the cars despite the railroad not always being at fault. As chief of the city freight terminal, A. Kapponen stated that due to the shortage of gasoline highway transportation meets only one-half of requests, and, in turn, this slows down the unloading. However, the representative of motor vehicle transportation of Estonia immediately lodged a complaint: At the freight terminal of Tallinn, the cranes were down and, consequently, the trucks being loaded were held over. Indeed, eight electric engines on the cranes were out of order. They were sent for repairs to Riga without receiving anything instead....

The following fact came to light: Despite the fuel shortage, motor vehicles took seven large-capacity containers from Tallinn to Izmail. The urgent nature of the cargo was the explanation. The railroad personnel did not agree with this: The containers could have been shipped by rail. It is understandable that the employees of motor vehicle transportation were attracted by the profitable ton-kilometers, loading to capacity, and a long haul. Under economic accountability, everybody strives to make more money at any price with no consideration given to overall results. What about coordination and teamwork? Why convene the coordination council then?

At the division, including the Tallinn Junction, there is an untapped reserve of loading assets—these are the residual stocks of cars being unloaded. Out of 223 enterprises of Estonia, only 80 met the norm of idle time on their spur lines in the [first] nine months! However, this aspect as well was sidestepped at the coordination council. Besides, the council does not have the right to influence other enterprises; it would be happy just putting its own domain in order!

The New Tallinn Port has its own problems: Out of the 191,000 tons of grain mentioned, 173,000 tons are in transit to Iran (the border station of Dzhulfa has been closed almost continuously since this summer). The grain has accumulated since August; the elevator is full, and the vessels arriving with grain are unloaded in a direct pattern into grain cars which are also in short supply. The port is requesting 200 grain cars despite being able to load up to 300 a day. However, the railroad meets less than one-half of requests which slows down the unloading of ships.

Difficulties with shipping butter have lasted for an inadmissibly long time: The accumulation of butter at the warehouses of the New Tallinn Port has been under way since 25 September. It is not even the availability of refrigerator car sections, but their preparation for loading that is at issue. The Estonian Division does not have a car washing installation which is already commonly known, and over one-half of sections arrive unwashed.

At the ministry, they are surprised by this as if it were news to them that as of now the standards at the railroads are not high enough to comply with all orders and instructions scrupulously. Due to the inferiority of the technical facilities of transportation, they operate on the principle: You need it—you do it! What is to be done if car-washing installations are few and far between on the railroad? So, they find the least economical way out: With the tacit approval of the ministry and the railroad, they load the sections with cocoa pods, imported paper, and other products which can be carried in boxcars as well. Meanwhile, the butter has been sitting in the warehouses since September.

They talk about this at every session of the coordination council in Tallinn. They vent their frustration and curse the MPS. This time around, the meeting also ended by stating a complaint.

The following question arises: Why have they not appealed to the leadership of the republic on behalf of the council for increasing at least the allocation of gasoline for transporting the freight away from port stations? After all, the appeal of the AUCCTU [All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions] Presidium in an open letter calls exactly for actions rather than talk. The letter says specifically: "...to organize the transition to a continuous sliding work schedule in the collectives of trade, ports, railroad stations, and unloading sites, with work on Saturdays and Sundays if necessary, with remuneration for labor in this case in keeping with the legislation, until the stream of freight completely returns to normal...." This is exactly what the council did not pay attention to.

Such councils were set up in the era of stagnation at all port junctions for determining the results of competitions, nominating winners, and awarding red pennants. At the time, they attached more hopes to socialist competition than to technology.

Chief of the Estonian Division Ya. Leshkin agrees with this. He proposes to set up a different coordinating council under the State Committee for Transportation of the republic. This is going to be a government-level institution to the meetings of which managers of enterprises and departments using transportation could be invited and summoned to report. Issues such as the supply of fuel, materials, and spare parts will be resolved quickly. The issue of building a modern car-washing installation may be raised once again before the union and republic ministries.

At present, the Estonian Division and the railroad operate in keeping with the principle "the oats are cheap but the boats are expensive." The runs of cars from Tallinn to Riga for washing and back do not just cost money—they cost a lot.

After the meeting of the coordinating council I met with Chairman of the Estonian Regional Trade Union of Railway Workers G. Zalikeshin.

Gennadiy Ivanovich said: "At present, we are holding reports- and-elections trade union conferences. The delegates are submitting proposals as to how to improve the transportation of freight. Trade unions are going to organize the provision of fully prepared meals and cafeterias at freight terminals and on the tracks where unloading and shipment of freight are performed. It is proposed that the workers take part in rendering assistance with unloading cars and trucks for payment by the piece and hourly wages. The request that the ministry discontinue its numerous unnecessary teleconferences during this hectic period has been made."

Albakin Stresses Need for Radical Economic Reform

LD1712121889 Prague Domestic Service in Czech 1000 GMT 17 Dec 89

[Text] Soviet Union—Leading Soviet economist Leonid Abalkin gave an interview to our journalists during an interval at Second Congress of People's Deputies. He stressed that radical economic reforms are inevitable with regard to further activity of the CEMA. Nevertheless, he rejected tendencies to switch over immediately to a market economy because so far we have neither market structures, information and commerce centers, tax inspection, nor experts. All of this could, according to Abalkin, take about 3 years to establish.

Official Outlines Anti-Inflation Measures

LD1812100989 Moscow TASS in English 0934 GMT 18 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 18 TASS—A price and inflation index system will be drawn up in the USSR in the first quarter of 1990, Vyacheslav Senchagov, chairman of the USSR State Committee for prices, writes in the newspaper GOVERNMENT HERALD.

The question of sizes, methods and terms of compensation for the growing cost of living, above all to low-income groups, is being considered, he said.

The growth in retail prices makes these measures necessary. The saturation of the market with commodities is now considerably lagging behind the growing incomes of the population. The unsatisfied demand now amounts to over 165 billion roubles, Senchagov reports.

The committee chairman speaks of measures to restrain the growth of prices. Limitations on the use of contract prices are being temporarily introduced to rule out a rise in retail prices of basic food and some socially significant non-food commodities.

According to the USSR Council of Ministers' decision, contract prices of new non-food commodities cannot be endorsed with a more than 30 per cent surcharge over state retail prices from January 1, 1990.

To restrain the export of commodities and products needed at home, Senchagov said, the USSR Supreme Soviet has banned the conclusion of economic agreements and contacts to export consumer goods and raw materials until set quotas are met.

The licensing of the export of consumer goods and basic types of raw materials to make them also be introduced, Senchagov stresed. Enterprises cannot now sell their products abroad without fulfilling the plan of deliveries for the home market.

The possibilities of the state order influencing the formation of the commodity market are also broadening. Along with the planned range of manufactured goods it will now include the production of basic types of raw materials, assembly parts and materials to make them.

Scientific

Cargo Rocket 'Progress M-2' To Dock With Mir

20 Dec Launching

LD2012045889 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0405 GMT 20 Dec 89

[Text] [No dateline as received] In accordance with the program for the further work of the "Mir" scientific research complex, the "Progress M-2" automatic cargo craft was launched in the Soviet Union at 0631 hours Moscow time [0331 GMT] on 20 December 1989.

The aim of the launch of the spacecraft is to deliver expendable materials and various cargoes to the "Mir" manned complex.

According to telemetric data, the on-board systems of the automatic cargo craft are functioning normally.

Further Details

LD1912223189 Moscow TASS in English 2154 GMT 19 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 19 TASS—By TASS Correspondent Rena Kuznetsova:

An unmanned cargo spacecraft is scheduled for launch in the Soviet Union on Wednesday at 06:31 Moscow time, an official from the Mission Control Centre told TASS.

Progress M-2 will dock with the Mir orbital station. The cargo it will bring to cosmonauts Aleksandr Viktorenko and Aleksandr Serebrov will include foodstuffs and water and a 40-kilogram parcel with new year presents.

The expedition on the orbital station will last until February 19, the official said.

During the remaining period, the cosmonauts plan five spacewalks. On February 1, they will try a "space motorcycle," a vehicle for moving in outer space.

During the spacewalks, Viktorenko and Serebrov will install star sensors and a cosmic ray detector outside the station and remove samples of materials left by a Soviet-French expedition.

Deputy Mission Head Viktor Blagov said Mir is yet to host three modules—technological, optical and international environmental ones. The latter is planned to be launched in mid-1991.

There are also plans for international space expeditions. Japanese and Britons are now training with Soviet cosmonauts at the Soviet Space Centre near Moscow. In January 1990 they will be joined by Austrians.

Orbital Observatory 'Granat' Continues Mission

LD1812143789 Moscow TASS in English 1332 GMT 18 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 18 TASS—By TASS correspondent from the long-distance space communications centre:

The orbital observatory "Granat", which was put into the high-elliptic orbit of an artificial earth satellite on December 2, continues its space mission.

There have been 24 communication sessions, during which specialists from the Semyon Lovachkin scientific production amalgamation confirmed the normal functioning of the on-board service systems of the spacecraft.

On December 11 the specialists together with experts from France, Denmark and Bulgaria began to check the scientific equipment. The testing, adjustment and calibration will be completed by the end of December.

In accordance with the flight programme, land-based stations of the Soviet command and measuring system continue to receive and process telemetric data from Granat.